The University of Chicago
Libraries

# THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

## PRESIDENT THWING'S BOOKS ON COLLEGE SUBJECTS

American Colleges: Their Students and Work
Within College Walls
The College Woman
The American College in American Life
College Administration
The Choice of a College
If I Were a College Student
A Liberal Education and a Liberal Faith
College Training and the Business Man
Higher Education in America: A History
Education in the Far East
History of Education in the United States Since the Civil War
Universities of the World
Letters from a Father to His Son Entering College
Letters from a Father to His Daughter Entering College
The Co-ordinate System of the Higher Education
The American College: What It Is and What It May Become
Education According to Some Modern Masters
The Ministry: An Appeal to College Men
The Training of Men for the World's Future
The College Gateway
The American Colleges and Universities in the Great War
The Higher Education in Australia and New Zealand
Human Australasia: Studies of Society and of Education
What Education Has the Most Worth? A Study in Educational Values, Conditions, Methods, Forces, and Results
The College President

# THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

BY

CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING

LL.D., LITT.D.

PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
AND ADELBERT COLLEGE

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1926

*All rights reserved*

LB2341
.T52
cop.6

Copyright, 1926,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and printed.
Published January, 1926.

10U copy released

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILL.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY
THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

Univ. Coll.

1506538

Property of
The University of Chicago
University College Reading Room

TO THE TRUSTEES AND TEACHERS
OF WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY AND
ADELBERT COLLEGE
WITH WHOM I WAS PRIVILEGED TO SERVE FOR
THIRTY-ONE YEARS AS PRESIDENT
THIS VOLUME IS DEDICATED
IN GRATITUDE AND AFFECTION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/collegepresident0000char_q8l3

# PREFATORY NOTE

This book is a study in human nature. The human nature which it seeks to study is embodied in a personality known as the president of an American college or university. In no small part, the volume comes out of a direct experience as president, covering many years. With the experience, of course, goes along, both as cause and result, a certain measure of observation, reflection, feeling and conclusion. It is clear, enough, moreover, that the observation, reflection, feeling and conclusion largely serve to constitute the experience.

Yet, the book has a look toward the future, as well as toward the past. Its writing has been quickened by the hope that possibly it might help a bit to a more appreciative understanding of the office of the chief executive of the higher education, and, therefore, to the progress of that education itself.

For, the president of the future is quick in my heart, as I write this preface—as he has also been present in my thought in the writing of the concluding chapter. In the University of Paris, in the early medieval period, the old master, in instituting the new master for its headship, gave to him a biretta as the badge of authority, a ring, symbol of his

espousal of science, a book, evidence of the knowledge acquired and to be transmitted, a kiss, token of affection, and a benediction. I wish I could make the presidents of the next decades feel how deep and how real is my wish for the best things for them and through them,—a wish shadowed forth in this mediaeval quintette of academic and personal tokens.

C. F. T.

Cleveland, 9th November, 1925.

# CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| PREFATORY NOTE | | vii |
| CHAPTER | | |
| I. | THE OFFICE AND TITLE | 1 |
| II. | RELATIONS | 10 |
| | 1. The Trustees | 10 |
| | 2. The Faculty | 30 |
| | 3. The Students | 58 |
| | 4. The Graduates | 73 |
| | 5. The Churches | 82 |
| | 6. (a) The High (Preparatory) School | 88 |
| | (b) The Graduate (Professional) School | 88 |
| | 7. Other Presidents | 92 |
| | 8. The Press | 98 |
| | 9. The General Community | 103 |
| III. | AS AN OFFICER AND AS A PERSONALITY | 123 |
| | 1. Health | 123 |
| | 2. Scholarship | 128 |
| | 3. Judicialness | 130 |
| | 4. Foresight | 134 |
| | 5. Leadership | 137 |
| | 6. Energy | 143 |
| | 7. Optimism | 147 |
| | 8. Patience | 149 |
| | 9. Adaptability | 151 |

PAGE

10. Conciliatoriness . . . . . 153
11. Institutional Accommodation . . 160
12. Sense of Proportion . . . . 163
13. Constructive Conservatism . . 164
14. Respect and Love . . . . . 165
15. Religion . . . . . 178
16. Organizing Power . . . . . 183
17. Autocracy . . . . . 190
18. Salary . . . . . 213
19. Writing and Speaking . . . . 218
20. Reports . . . . . 223

CHAPTER

IV. Perils . . . . . 231

V. Rewards . . . . . 287

VI. The Future of the Office . . . . 311

Index . . . . . 337

# THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

# THE COLLEGE PRESIDENT

## CHAPTER I

### THE OFFICE AND TITLE

The present office and title of president crown a long and diverse historic development. Both the name and the service intimate the inheritance and survival of many academic forces, methods, and conditions. Having the philological worth of a good classical origin, the word has become, in America, the most common title borne by the head of a college or of a university. Its connotations stand for those duties and rights which belong to an academic executive, for those privileges which are granted to wise college counselors, and for those opportunities for service which are given to helpers of great educational causes.

In the year 1640, the magistrates and elders of Massachusetts Bay voted that Mr. Henry Dunster be invited to be the president of Harvard College. The title, thus begun, has continued for almost three centuries, being given, including two vice-presidents, to

twenty-four incumbents. The only exception lies in the fact that to Increase Mather was given, for a time, the title of rector.[1]

The charter granted to the College of William and Mary, in 1693, contains the term, president. It is also used in the charter of 1729. The terms, chancellor and rector, too, were used in the earlier charter, but not as a substitute for the title of president. For the chancellor was an officer, appointed for seven years, to serve in an advisory relation. He represented the interests of the college in England,—and the first chancellor, by the way, was Henry, Bishop of London. George Washington, too, was chancellor of the college after the Revolution. The rector also gave a temporary service. He was chosen for a year, serving as president of the board of visitors. In this relationship, the term is still used.

At Yale, the title, rector, was used for almost its first half-century. There is reason to believe that this name was adopted instead of president as being less pretentious. It was thought by some that a simple name might lessen the peril of interference on the part of certain governmental authorities. In 1745, however, the title, president, was substituted for rector, as representing a more permanent, distinguished, and suitable foundation.[2]

[1] A History of Harvard University, from Its Foundation, in the Year 1636, to the Period of the American Revolution. By Benjamin Peirce. p. 63.

[2] In an address, "An Historical Study of the Powers and Duties of the Presidency in Yale College," given before the

At the University of Pennsylvania, from its founding in 1746, the title of provost has been used, and this is the only title that has been used, in describing its chief officer. In Columbia for five years (1811-

American Antiquarian Society in 1897, Franklin B. Dexter, that eminent scholar of Yale's early history, referring to Rector Clap, says:

"His great achievement was a remodeling of the charter, which he carried through the corporation in 1744, and through the General Assembly in 1745, at a time when that body was favorably impressed by his agreement with them in regard to putting down lawless 'New Lights' in theology. By all odds the most significant and most far-reaching provision of the revised instrument was the transformation of the Board of Trustees, of which the Rector was a recent and undistinguished member, into a new corporation, styled the President and Fellows—the President (that is, the former Rector) being the centre and head of the whole, and the rest of the Board (that is, the ten successors of the original Trustees) his coadjutors or Fellows—a tremendously momentous revolution, marking an authorized though perhaps unrealized transfer of the seat of power, which would probably have been thwarted a few years earlier, when those of the older generation of Trustees who retained with more force and tenacity the original conception of their office were still active in the counsels of the Corporation. I view this revision as a turning point in the fortunes of the College. Under the charter as it was, the assumed power of the Rector, such as Clap was wielding, rested on no stable foundation. After nearly fifty years that officer was still in law merely an upper hired servant or resident agent of the Trustees, subject to peremptory dismissal with or without cause by a majority of those who had appointed him, while the office itself might be abolished at pleasure." Report of the Council of the American Antiquarian Society, of the Annual Meeting, October 21, 1897. p. 10.

1816) a provost was installed as a superior to the president, the office of president being still continued as it had been used from the beginning.

A term historic in all academic annals, chancellor, has been used in America, with a frequency somewhat akin to that of the term provost. At the present time, institutions as old and as new, and as diverse, in origin and history, as New York University, Syracuse University, the University of Pittsburgh, Kansas University, and Leland Stanford, apply the term to the chief executive officer.

Each of these several titles, used in American colleges, has an academic history older than the settlement or even the discovery of America. In Great Britain the title, president, is applied to four of the colleges of Oxford ( Magdalen, Corpus Christi, St. John's, and Trinity), and to one (Queen's) of Cambridge. It is also used in the University and College of Bristol, of Newcastle, and of the three Queen's Colleges of Ireland. The name, rector, is used at Oxford as applied to the head of Exeter and of Lincoln. Master is, however, the most common term at both Oxford and Cambridge colleges. In the Scottish universities, according to the Acts of 1858 and 1859, the term, rector, frequently enlarged to Lord Rector, is used. The officer is chosen by the students and for the brief period of three years. The title and service are largely honorary.

The title, chancellor, has a long and diverse history in both imperial and ecclesiastical relationships,

as well as educational. The office was at times a petty one, and again of the highest importance. In general it has had a declining value. The title was introduced into England by Edward the Confessor. The chancellor was the secretary, having charge of charters, letters, and official writings, of the sovereign. In the church, and in the orders of knighthood, too, the word has its place. In the earlier time the chancellor was often a connecting link between the pope and the university. At Oxford and Cambridge the chancellor was endowed with full authority and became chief executive officer. Laud was chancellor of Oxford, and issued the famous Caroline Statutes in 1636. But, since his time, the function of the chancellor has usually been performed by the vice-chancellor. At present the office itself is largely honorary.

The term, principal, is nearest akin, in British and Continental use, to the title of president. It was used at Brasenose, Oxford, as early as 1509. It is still used in three of the Cambridge colleges and also in the four Scottish universities. The term seems also to be especially common in women's colleges and in colleges founded by the church. In America it is more commonly limited to the head of a high school or academy.

The provost, of peculiarly ecclesiastical origin and service, was the head of a chapter or community of persons concerned with religious observances. In the cathedral or collegiate church, the provost was the chief officer. In the convent, he ranked next to

the abbot. It is found in use at Oriel as early as 1324. The head of Trinity at Dublin is called provost. Besides its most historic American use in the University of Pennsylvania, the term has recently come to be applied, with one or two marked exceptions, to a secondary office in the American university, an office which has many of the diverse functions of a vice-presidency. The more conspicuous instances are found in Columbia, in Yale, and in Johns Hopkins. The office might in general be interpreted as standing for either an assistant to the president, or the assistant president. In 1920, the board of trustees of the University of Illinois substituted the office of provost for the office of vice-president which was practically abolished.

The designation of warden has not secured a wide adoption, despite its early origin. It apparently was first used at Merton in the middle of the great thirteenth century, and it has continued. The reason of this use of the term probably lies in the fact that the head of the college had as a chief function the serving as *custos* of the estate of the founder, whose name the college bears. Though this interpretation may be of doubtful value, it may be added that fit use of any one of the several titles of so great variety at the Oxford and Cambridge colleges is still more doubtful. In the wish or the will of a founder may lie the reason for each designation. But such an intimation only pushes the inquiry back a still further step into academic and historical obscurity.

The term, proctor, in American usage, applies to a minor officer whose duties seem to be of a supervisory, or even of a police, character, over students. Yet, historically, the word represents functions somewhat akin to those of the president. But the more dignified relationships of the service long ago passed away.

The diversities, and even inconsistencies, in the origin, significance, and use of historic academic titles are well set forth in the customs now prevailing in the four Scotch universities. The principals of Aberdeen, of St. Andrews, and of Glasgow, are appointed by the crown, and the principal at Edinburgh by a body known as curators who represent both the university and the city. The appointment is for life. The principal is resident head of the university and president of the academic senate. The senate consists of all the professors. The principal is also a member of the university court, and in the absence of the rector, which is usual,—for that office has become mainly honorary,—serves as chairman of the university court, as well. The university court consists of fourteen members, including the rector, principal, lord provost of the city, and other members. Furthermore, the principal is the chairman, in the absence of the chancellor and of the rector, of the general council which is made up of the chancellor, the members of the court and of the senate, and of all graduates. The principal is also appointed by the chancellor to serve as vice-chancellor in the chan-

cellor's absence. As vice-chancellor his duties are many, diverse, and somewhat complex.

In the universities of the Continent, and indeed of the whole world, the term rector has proved to be the most significant and customary. In Italy,—that original fount of university education,—it was first applied to civil officers and to officers of guilds, as early as the twelfth century, after the revival of the study of the Roman law. The universities in turn adopted the term from the guilds. From its usage at Bologna, it spread to other higher schools. The power of the rector was as great, as his jurisdiction was wide. That power seems to have been as autocratic over the professors as it is usually supposed to be in the most absolute government of a modern American college.

A similar authority was vested, also, in the thirteenth century, in the rector of the equally historic University of Paris. He is called the master of faculties, taking precedence of deans and of proctors. By a gradual process, the rector emerged into the headship of the whole university. The process was almost as undefined as it was slow in its moving. In the last decades of the thirteenth century, and in the middle of the fourteenth, he had come to be acknowledged as the formal president, or head, of the university.[3]

The German universities follow the French and

[3] The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages. By Hastings Rashdall. Vol. I, p. 329.

the Italian model, but with variations. In Berlin, the full title is rector *magnificus,* and in Gniessen, *magnificentissimus.* The Swiss adopt a similar custom. In the Netherlands, too, rector is the more usual title. Madrid, Barcelona, and other Spanish universities, also employ the term, rector, as do the universities of South America of Spanish foundation. The historic university of Athens, as well as several Russian universities, use the term, rector. Upsala employs both rector and chancellor.

As one examines the titles of the officers of the universities of the world, one finds that the term, rector, is the most historic and general designation of the headship. If president is the more prevailing title in the universities of North America, rector is of almost equal prevalence in all other parts. The arguments—philological, historical, legal—however, for the American usage, in a new and democratic commonwealth, seem to be sufficient. From Dunster of Harvard, of the fifth decade of the seventeenth century, down to the present year, it has been generally applied, and to no less than three thousand heads of American colleges and universities.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATIONS

The relations which the American college president holds are more numerous, diverse, and complex than those of any other educational officer. If one should make a diagram of the duties and rights of his office, the lines would be found beginning with either the United States or the individual commonwealth, and, after going through many boards and other bodies, ending with single individuals. But, among these bodies are found several to which, under differing forms, he holds relations, fundamental, constructive, and always important. To these bodies he is organically related. With other forces or movements his relation may be either superficial or timely.

### 1. The Trustees

The first of these relations, first in point of time and, in certain respects, first in importance, is the relation to the board of trustees. The college or the university is a formal, corporate body, instituted by special charter or under the general law of the individual state. The technical corporation is usually known as the board of trustees. It bears, how-

ever, different names in different states. The board of trustees is the more normal, especially in the endowed universities, and the title fittingly represents the duties, functions, and rights of the institution. The term trustees quickens the important question, "Trustees for whom, or for what?" The term applies immediately to the holding or use of property. The comprehensive answer is that the body of trustees holds property for the benefit of the community. The community may be organized into formal political states, or it may be unorganized. But, in either interpretation, the legal body is serving for the advantage of the people of the commonwealth. The intimation has sometimes been advanced that the board of trustees is responsible only to itself. Such an interpretation fails to recognize the fundamental elements of the purpose and function of an educational institution.[4]

[4] After a survey of several colleges, a competent observer, John Palmer Gavit, says:

"All the college presidents with whom I have talked believe that a trustee should be invariably a graduate of the college; that this is not the place for the injection of 'outside' blood. I think they are mistaken; that every board of college trustees should contain not only one or more graduates of other colleges, but a representation of the outside, non-collegiate world. One trouble with these institutions, especially those heavily endowed and so more or less independent of public confidence and support, is that they get a disproportionate idea of their own importance and omniscience; have a super-sense of the impeccability of their own institution and a more or less dense ignorance of the progress of the world. Only about one per cent

Besides the title trustees, or board of trustees, other names include the board of regents, obtaining in about one-third of the state universities, or the board of curators, as in Missouri, or the state board of education, as in Iowa and Montana, titles used in colleges and universities of a more public character. In certain colleges are found two legal bodies, in some respects coördinate, in other respects superior and subordinate. At Harvard the two bodies bear the name of Corporation, and of Overseers; in Brown University, Board of Fellows, of twelve members, and Board of Trustees, of thirty-six members; in Bowdoin, two, bearing the name of Board of Trustees and Board of Overseers,[5] the first having four-

of the population gets to college at all; they would do well to consult in matters of policy and management with selected representatives of the human race. Moreover, college presidents and trustees might once in a while recall the fact that even the most impregnably endowed institution is heavily subsidized by the public through the mere fact —so often naïvely overlooked—of exemption from the taxation which falls so heavily upon the rest of us. They have scant title to regard their doings as none of our business. What if we should change our minds and tax them as we tax ourselves?"—Bulletin of The American Association of University Professors, Vol. VIII, November, 1922, p. 64.

[5] More than a hundred years ago, the elder President Dwight of Yale wrote of Bowdoin College:

"This institution, like the University at Cambridge, is encumbered with two legislative bodies; a board of Trustees; and a board of Overseers: the former having power to originate, the latter to negative, academical measures. This unfortunate complication of government renders its whole state uncertain, prolix, and indecisive; furnishes

teen, and the second forty-two, members. A single body, however, is, with a few exceptions, the common form in American institutions.

To this legal body, the president bears relations

room for the operation of multiplied personal interests, prejudices, intrigues. and unfortunate compromises; and, generally, prevents the order, energy, and decision, attendant upon a single board. A body of Overseers, occasionally called together to meddle with the affairs of a College, will usually feel so little interest in them, except at the moment, as never to be in possession of the system, intended to be pursued; the wisdom, and expediency, of one part of which will often depend more on its relation to other parts, than on its own nature. Often they will not come together, at all, in such numbers as to form a quorum; and will thus prevent the accomplishment of the business, for which they were summoned. The very numbers, of which they consist, will of course include many, who are incompetent judges of academical concerns; and many more, who will never take pains to inquire into their nature, or to possess themselves of that judgment, which their capacity would in better circumstances enable them to form. Their decisions, therefore, will often be sudden; often crude, and not unfrequently hostile to the very interests, which they would wish to promote. To secure the prosperity of such an institution, it is indispensably necessary, that a system, embracing all its interests for a considerable period at least, should be carefully formed, and closely pursued. All, who are to vote, should distinctly understand this system; and, whenever they come to act, should have it fully in their minds; so as to comprehend readily the relation, which every new measure has to the general scheme, and its proper influence on measures already adopted. This can be done, only on a long continued, and minute acquaintance with the affairs of the institution; and can never be done by men, who, occupied busily in totally different concerns, come rarely and casually, to the consideration

permanent and fundamental.[6] By this body he has been elected to his office, and to this body he owes his most prevailing duty or duties. The nature of these duties certain colleges define by statute, or by code of rules. In other colleges the constitution is unwritten. In case there be a code, the definition is of

of these. The votes of such men will be governed by the impulse of the moment; by whim; by prejudice; by attachment to a friend, or a party; and sometimes, not improbably, by the mere fact, that their duty requires them to vote: when, perhaps, they are wholly at a loss whether the vote, actually given, will be useful, or mischievous. If such a system be not so pursued; the interests of a public seminary can never become prosperous, unless by accident, or by the peculiarly meritorious labours of a wise and vigorous Faculty; overcoming many disadvantages, and preventing with uncommon prudence, and felicity, the mischievous effects of indigested, desultory regulations." Travels in New England and New York: Journey to White Mountains. By Timothy Dwight. Vol. II, Letter XXI, pp. 212-213.

[6] "They [the trustees] are," said President Olds in his inaugural address, "from the standpoint of the law, Amherst College. They are the foundation head of all authority. They receive benefactions, care for funds, make appointments, grant degrees. With power, goes responsibility; with responsibility, action; with action, as they have learned from the experience of office, criticism. And college trustees —I refer now to the class throughout our whole land— form the most powerful, the most responsible, the most abused of all who are connected with our institutions of higher learning; and they have not the consolation of distinction or the makeweight of glory. I do not recall a single tablet with the inscription, 'Trustee of Blank College.' Their contribution to college administration is unrewarded as it is fundamental."—Address of President Olds, Amherst, November 14, 1924.

a general character.[7] Comprehensively these duties are embraced in the word leadership. He is the guide of the corporate body. This body may be composed of a few persons, as at Stanford; or of many, as at Wesleyan (Connecticut), of fifty-three. But, whether the membership be small or large, whether the bodies be single or duplex, among the members will be found a large variety of educational

[7] The following definition is representative:

"The President of the University shall be the Executive head of the University and of the Board of Trustees, of the University Faculty and of the Faculty of each College and School of the University. He shall be ex officio a member of the Board of Trustees, shall preside at all meetings of the Board, shall be ex officio an additional member of all Trustees' committees, of the Faculty of the University and of the Faculty of each College and School thereof, and shall preside at the meetings of such Faculties. As executive head he shall have the duties that are from time to time conferred upon him by the Board of Trustees or Faculties in their respective jurisdictions. He shall make an annual report of the work of the institution, in writing, to the Board of Trustees, outlining its conditions, prospects and needs and . . . shall be the instrument of contact between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty. The President shall bring matters of business from the University Faculty and the several Faculties before the Trustees or before the committees herein provided for, or such business may be presented to the Board or to its committees at any time in written communications from the Secretary of the Faculty or Faculties, or by the Executive Committee. . . . He shall sign, together with the Secretary, all contracts, legal documents, obligations and diplomas authorized by the Board of Trustees."—Article III of the By-Laws of Western Reserve University.

experiences, and also an equal diversity of judgment respecting the functions of a college. The body of trustees is a microcosm of the whole community, as indeed it ought to be. But in it also is found, as there ought to be, a certain proportion who know the history, understand the character, and appreciate the duties and the rights, the methods and the ends, of the higher education. In general, two characteristics are found prevailing among members of the boards of trustees: first, conservatism, and, second, a general lack of expert educational knowledge. The university is a conservative institution. Such it is by its foundation and through its general relation to the community. The safety, therefore, of following well-tried methods, rather than the peril of adopting new ones, makes a special appeal to trustees. As says John Bascom, president of the University of Wisconsin: "The resistance of conservation is sustained by the inertia of men, and by the convictions of a few eminently wise men, who fear the dissolving force of change on the safeguards of custom."[8] To the great majority, moreover, of the members of a board of trustees, the college business is not a matter of primary importance. Other interests, professional, commercial, industrial, claim their deeper and more constant attention. For, among all colleges, about one-half of the membership are members of the professions, and about one-third are business

[8] Things Learned by Living. By John Bascom. p. 113.

men. As a rule, therefore, they are not experts in affairs academic.

Trustees, too, who are successful business men are often, too often, open to the charge of interpreting a college as a business corporation. They give their approval to a president who wins an increasing number of students, whose annual budgets show a credit balance, who keeps the college in a proper degree in the public eye and in consequent proper recognition and esteem, whose administration is characterized by peace among his associates, who is progressive in method and monumental in achievement. Such trustees, masters of manufacturing and of merchandizing, are inclined to standardize a college as they do their plant and the plant's output. There is indeed a certain analogy between a factory and a college. They both represent a material equipment, they embody human service, they create results which benefit the people. They also are concerned with a necessary relationship between the expense account and the income. But the analogy presently ends. For, well-educated men and women are not as iron and steel, flour and cloths. The atmospheres, intellectual, ethical, spiritual, and all the constant results of the higher education, are not like the direct and indirect products of blast furnaces, of coke ovens, and of gas and oil wells. The two processes are as unlike as are the life of the rose bush and the soil out of which the rose bush grows. To attempt to administer a college

as one manages a cotton mill, or to seek to judge its products by like standards, is disastrous to each, and lamentable to all. Let the value of each be properly appreciated and assessed, but let there be no attempt at identification.

The geographical distribution of the members of a board may be wide, covering the whole country, as in the case of a national university it should be, or it may be confined to the individual state, or group of states, as the conditions make fitting. But a certain proportion of members should belong to the immediate neighborhood in which the college is placed. For, many questions, either serious or complex, may suddenly emerge, demanding an immediate answer. But in this necessary localization lies a peril. Trustees in immediate residence may easily exert undue influence in the administration. To have an influence which is strong and yet not over-persuasive, confining themselves to problems which must be solved at once, and not committing the whole board to doubtful policies, recognizing both their responsibilities and their limitations, is the model which local trustees may well seek to follow.

To this body of trustees, diverse in membership, conservative in character, and unexpert in knowledge, the president is to bear, as I have said, the relation of leadership.[9] Leadership embraces at least five

[9] "In retiring from executive work I relieved my mind by a few notes on the university presidency in America and its relation to the general subject of higher education.

elements: first, the understanding of the aim or purpose of the movement for which leadership is desired, or to which it is given; second, an apprehension, or better a comprehension, of the nature of the movement in question; third, acquaintance with, or friendship with, those whom one is leading; fourth, tolerance; and, fifth, courage.

These formed in some sense my answer to the assertion that the office is an anomaly in academic development, the conventional head being a 'monarch' in a body which should function as a democracy, and that in proportion to his monopoly of public attention on the one hand and of power on the other, the scholars who really compose the institution suffer a lowering of their relative valuation.

"In this indictment there is a certain degree of truth. The office of president, however, must be considered as representing a temporary stage in the development of 'a republic of science and letters,' though under present conditions he is indispensable to such achievement. . . .

"All our universities are still in process of creation. 'An institution is the elongated shadow of a man.' The president must furnish the initiative, set the pace, give color to a growing organism. He must consider relative values —what expenditures of money will most count in the long run—besides ways and means by which the necessary money can be obtained. He must thus be the servant, not the master, of the scholars whose activities he assists or directs.

"So long as no single institution of higher learning in America has its permanent form, so long as its administration is a forward urge, not a function, every college or university must recognize some personal leader. On the whole, the operations of presidents have been marked by wise patience and well-considered action. We cannot do without them yet."—The Days of a Man. By David Starr Jordan. Vol. II, Footnote. pp. 458-459.

In addition to these elements and yet emphasizing them, three further qualities are to be named, foresight, aggressiveness, and patience. The president is to be a prophet. He is to be a prophet, not in the narrow though proper sense of avoiding danger, but in the sense of having a far-off look. Such was the quality which White attributed to the man whose name is forever attached to the university which, with White, he founded: "Of his intellectual characteristics, foresight was the most remarkable. Of all men in the country who had to do with the college land grant of 1862, he alone discerned the possibilities involved and had courage to make them actual."[10] A like foresight characterized the great Wayland of Brown. He anticipated, by a generation, the installation and the development of the elective system of studies. His partial failure in the actual permanent introduction of the method does not at all lessen the worth of his prophetic interpretation. As President Eliot has said to me, Wayland was really the founder of the elective system. Some would add that the system goes back to Thomas Jefferson and his historic university.

With foresight is to be united the spirit of progressiveness or of aggressiveness. This spirit, too, is to be applied to the future. A college is an historical institution. It therefore looks, and ought to look, toward the past. As an institution for human service, it

[10] Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White. Vol. I. p. 327.

looks, and ought to look, toward the future also. The past is past. If the past demands the historian, the service of the future represents and calls for the administrator, and for the executive. In both functions, which are yet one, progressiveness is an essential element. Of course, the progressiveness is to be as free from rashness as it is remote from reaction. As I have intimated, boards are usually conservative, and perhaps ought to be conservative,—as in like measure the president is, and should be, progressive. His progressiveness should be as widely separated from eccentricity as it is from rashness, and as remote from narrowness as it is from shallowness. It is ever to be joined to patience,[11]—patience, that virtue and that grace which college executives are liable to lack in relation to the board of trust and which, of all virtues and graces, is most urgently needed. It is said that Pitt was once discussing the virtues of a prime minister. It was suggested that

[11] A friend of Lord Kelvin reports him as saying: "Patience, great patience is the need of this generation. It asks results before it earns them. Man is too wasteful of the resources he finds in the earth. The most of our coal is lost in smoke; the most of our heat is dissipated in the air. We need patience not less than courage in dealing with our problems."—London Days. By Arthur Warren. p. 112.

Mr. Asquith, too, once said, in the House of Commons: "A very long and sometimes disappointing experience of public life has taught me one thing, and that is the value, and indeed the necessity, of patience."—British Weekly, June 5, 1924. p. 211.

the chief virtues were knowledge, toil, eloquence. "No," said Pitt, "the great virtue is patience." The remark is to be applied also to the college president.

President White of Cornell illustrates the worth of this virtue and grace. The difficulties attending the legal and academic foundation of Cornell University were many, diverse, and long-continued. The jealousy of denominational colleges of the state of New York, the desire on the part of many to turn Ezra Cornell away from his purpose, the personal antagonisms of members of the legislature, the restrictions which it was sought to lay upon the financial and academic founders, the charges made that the Cornell Bill was a monopoly, a wild project, a selfish scheme, a job, a grab, and the personal accusations against those interested in laying the foundation as either dupes or knaves, were continuous and bitter. But both Cornell and White bore such charges with equanimity, and met them with force, justice, and kindness. Seldom have founders been obliged to suffer severer opposition in seeking to do good to humanity.

If patience be a virtue to be borne by the president in relation to the board of trustees, there is no less need, it should be added, of patience on the part of the trustees with the president himself. In times of public excitement and debate, such as a sharp, national political campaign may create, boards of trustees are somewhat prone to be unduly moved. In such a mood, they may be guilty of procedures which work ultimate damage to their university and also to

the whole cause of the higher education. Such was the condition in the year 1896 which resulted in the lamentable retirement of Andrews from the presidency of Brown University. The editor of the *Educational Review,* at the time, wrote:

"The governing board of the institution substantially asked President Andrews either to give up his opinions on a political and economic question of present importance and interest, or to suppress the expression of those views. The reason assigned was that, otherwise, the university would lose financial support. The idea that no 'university' was worth supporting in which freedom of opinion on such a subject was not permitted, apparently never occurred to them at all. The highest regard was expressed for President Andrews as a man, and his services to Brown were emphasized in the very letter that conveyed the intimation referred to. By commending President Andrews's services as an educational administrator and by extolling him as a man, the trustees put themselves hopelessly and irrevocably in the wrong. They narrowed the issue to one of *Lehrfreiheit* and precluded themselves from asserting that President Andrews was a man of unsound judgment, flighty views, and unstable opinions, and so a source of weakness to the University. Whether true or not, such a charge might easily be a question on which opinions could honestly differ.

"The gentlemen who wrote to President Andrews on the matter were not politicians and schemers, but

men of the highest social, professional, and business standing. This gives a seriousness to the incident that can hardly be overestimated. Put bluntly, it signifies that Rhode Island and Providence will not support an educational institution in which an officer of prominence holds views antagonistic to their own on an economic question that is under present discussion. It will not do for these gentlemen to say that President Andrews's views are dishonest and immoral. That is one of the very points at issue, and the analogies by which such a statement would be supported are grossly misleading. Freedom of opinion and expression on this subject, at least, will not be permitted at Brown University.

"This being the case, President Andrews took the only course open to him when he wrote to the governing board that he should find himself 'unable to meet the wishes of the corporation, as explained by the special committee recently appointed to confer with me on the interests of the university, without surrendering that reasonable liberty of utterance which my predecessors, my faculty colleagues, and myself have hitherto enjoyed, and in the absence of which the most ample endowment for an educational institution would have but little worth, I respectfully resign the Presidency of the university, and also my professorship therein.' "[12] Seen in retrospect, after and through a generation, I am sure it would be generally acknowledged that such an endeavor as re-

[12] Editorial. Educational Review, Vol. XIV, September, 1897. pp. 200-201.

sulted in President Andrews' resignation, even if undertaken in the highest degree of conscientiousness, was mistaken in its origin, was carried forward with intellectual narrowness, was unduly extravagant in its zeal, and was wholly unfortunate in its results, both for an historic university and for its able and beloved president.

A far better and wiser method was found in the comparative indifference in which the service of Mark Hopkins, as a presidential elector on the regular Republican ticket in the election of 1884 was regarded. Mark Hopkins had indeed, at the time, retired formally from his presidency. But he was still the great heart and the great head of Williams College. That campaign, in which James G. Blaine and Grover Cleveland were the respective candidates of the national parties, was indeed one which called out political zeal and partisan discrimination and indeed personal antagonisms, quite as urgently as the campaign of 1896, in which Andrews suffered for his loyalty to his political and economic principles.

One constant and insistent relation of the trustees and the president relates to the matter of the annual income and expenditure. It is a simple axiom of college finance that the income should not fall below the expense, or, in a more vital form, that expense should not exceed income. In the preparation, therefore, of the annual budget of each June, this axiom is to rule. In the application of this principle, some presidents are liable to lead trustees astray. The revenue from investments may not prove to be, in

the course of a forthcoming year, as great as there was reason to expect. The revenue from students, too, may fall off by reason of the falling off of the number of students themselves. Expenses, likewise unanticipated, occur. The result, therefore, is a constant peril of deficits. In fact, certain colleges do adopt budgets, under the leadership, or suffering, of presidents which represent at the very time of their adoption a larger expense than the revenue represents. I know of one college whose custom it is to adopt a budget of some thirty thousand dollars in excess of the assured income. I know of a university whose president assumed that the trustees would meet a deficit of more than one hundred thousand dollars. Such methods are not good. They are not good for either trustees or president. For, constant deficits irritate official boards. Constant deficits weaken the assurance of givers in the soundness of judgment or even in the honesty of a college administration. In general, the financial administration of our colleges must be wise in method in order to be sound in result. Trustees should demand of a president a budget which shall work without anxiety to either themselves or to their chief officer.

Whenever the relation of the president to the board of trustees is rightly understood, it is the most satisfactory of all public human relations. It unites the president with men and women who are leaders of the community. Together they are engaged in a common service than which none is more useful. This

service relates to the youth of the community. It thus helps to form and to determine the future. It touches the home. For the reaction of college youth on the home is salutary. It relates to all educational conditions. For the college represents educational leadership and enrichment. It combines the cardinal intellectual verities and the cardinal moral virtues. It stands for the transmutation of material forces into spiritual values. It embodies a distinct element and force in the progress of civilization. In order to secure such happiness on the part of the president, it is important that the president should command the confidence of the board of trustees and that the board of trustees should command his confidence. The function and place of the board have been well interpreted by an administrator of broad and diverse educational experience, Andrew S. Draper:

"The special circumstances of the universities, and the practically uniform plan of corporate management in America, developed the board of trustees in our universities, with functions and powers subordinate to and consistent with, and exercised in a similar manner with, those which are held by the sovereign legislative authority over all corporations. Trustees stand for the legislature so far as the law permits.

"The trustees of a university are charged by law, either statutory or judge-made, or by a widely-acknowledged usage, with that general oversight and that legislative direction which will assure the true execution of the trust. They are to secure revenues

and control expenditures. They are to prevent waste and assure results. They are never to forget that they represent the people who created and who maintain the university. They are not to represent these people as a tombstone might,—but as living men may. They are to do the things their principals would assuredly do if in their places, to enlarge the advantage to the *cestui que trust*. . . .

"The trustees do not live upon the campus, and they are not assumed to be professional educationalists. Their judgment is likely to be quite as good as to the relations of the work to the public interests, and as to what the institution should do to fulfill its mission, as that of any expert would be. To get done what they want done, they must enact directions and appoint competent agents. The individual trustee has no power of supervision or direction not given to him by the recorded action of the Board. What they do is to be done *in session*, after the modification of individual opinions through joint and formal discussion. It must be reduced to exact form and stand in permanent record. . . . They are bound to regard expert opinion and to appoint agents who can render a more expert service than any others who can be procured. They are to keep the experts sane, on the earth, in touch with the world, as it were. They are to sustain agents and help them to succeed, and they are to remove agents who are not successful. From a point of view remote enough and high enough, they are to inspect the whole field. They are bound to be

familiar with all that the institution is doing. They are to be alert in keeping the whole organization free from whatever may corrupt, and up to the very top notch of efficient public service. There is too much money involved to permit of idle experimentation, too high interests at stake to allow of vacillation and uncertainty. Under a responsibility that is unceasing and unrelenting they must learn the truth and never hesitate to act upon it." [13]

A similar interpretation was found realized in the relation of Raymond, the first, and great, president of Vassar. Early in the year 1865, before the formal opening, Raymond wrote, saying: "I have spent several evenings with Mr. Vassar going over my plan, and he says it 'hits the notch exactly.' The dear old gentleman is full of hope and of faith in my ability to carry out all his ideas and realize his great object, and seems delighted with the picture I have sketched of the machine at work." [14]

The confidence of a board of trustees in its president has seldom been more fittingly expressed than in the invitation of the trustees of Clark University given to G. Stanley Hall to become its head. The official letter intimates the wisdom of method, the judicial faith, and the high purpose of the trustees:

"They desire to impose on you no trammels; they

[13] The University Presidency. By Andrew S. Draper. The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. XCVII. January, 1906, p. 37.

[14] Life and Letters of John Howard Raymond. Edited by his eldest daughter. pp. 531-532.

have no friends for whom they wish to provide at the expense of the interests of the institution; no pet theories to press upon you in derogation of your judgment; no sectarian tests to apply; no guarantees to require, save such as are implied by your acceptance of this trust. Their single desire is to fit men for the highest duties of life, and to that end, that this institution, in whatever branches of sound learning it may find itself engaged, may be a leader and a light.'' [15]

## 2. The Faculty

Not a few of the qualities which characterize, and many of the elements which constitute, the relation of a president to the board of trustees, are also to be found in his relations to the teaching staff, usually called the faculty. Beginning with a general meaning, the word faculty has, in academic usage, come to stand for that body whose members are engaged in teaching or in research. But the emphasis to be laid upon these elements and qualities takes on a somewhat different strain when applied to the faculty than when applied to the board of trust. In the relation of the president to the faculty, the chief thing to be desired is sympathy. This sympathy is intellectual as well as emotional. It includes knowledge of the problems of the professor, an appreciation of his difficulties, an understanding of the conditions under

[15] Clark University, 1889-1899. Decennial Celebration. p. 4.

which he labors, a knowledge of the methods which he uses, and of the ends which he desires to gain. It also embraces a sense of good fellowship, and, if possible, of real affection. It includes personal, as well as more formal, relations. The sympathy, moreover, which should dominate the relation of the faculty and the president, leads to direct coöperation. The president as an administrator does not forget that, in the original meaning of the word, he is to give service. He is not primarily a ruler, much less a monarch. As a coöperator, he is to seek to carry out the purposes of each teacher, giving to the teacher proper tools, and insuring to him the best conditions. This coöperation does not neglect details, and ever embraces principles and fundamental methods. Such coöperation usually, and finally, heads up in the budget which is always to be of the largest generosity to the teacher. Not a few examples of such sympathy and coöperation, given and accepted, can be easily suggested. Professor Murray, dean of Princeton, says of President Wayland, of Brown.

"His relations to his colleagues in the faculty were as close and kindly as it is possible for such to be. The success of any administration turns largely upon this. Nothing better tests the native qualities of leadership than such a post. The art cannot be acquired. It is born in the man. And it was easily seen that Mr. Wayland was a born leader. His strong and clear judgment inspired the confidence of his subordinates, whom, indeed, he treated as his associates. His con-

tagious earnestness, his laborious fidelity as a college officer, brought up all his colleagues to his own standard. He had able coadjutors. They caught his spirit and wrought under him with a will." [16]

Of President Fairchild of Oberlin, who was, in several relations, for sixty-eight years associated with this historic college, his colleague, Judson Smith, says:

"He shared with his professors all the honor and repute and glory that came to the college during his administration. We were made to feel that the college was *ours* as truly as it was *his*, that its success depended on *us* as much as on *him*, that we were equal partners in a great enterprise into which it was our duty and our joy to throw all our enthusiasm and gifts and powers and to devote to it our lives themselves. We all knew that *he* was the *great* man among us, that he meant more to the college than any one of us ever could; and it was a privilege to work with him, under his leadership, in a great task to which his presence gave dignity and priceless worth." [17]

A similar influence characterized the administration of President Francis A. Walker of the Institute of Technology. His biographer, speaking of that center of administrative interest, the faculty meeting, says:

[16] Francis Wayland. By James O. Murray. pp. 73-74.

[17] James Harris Fairchild. By Albert Temple Swing. p. 389.

"He was always the equal participant, never the educational autocrat. He successfully avoided the too common practice of college executives in this supposedly democratic country, of entering a meeting of the faculty clothed with presidential majesty and armed with special authority from the trustees to lay down to these 'servants' of the college, without possibility of real argument or true discussion, certain predetermined decrees. Every plan which he brought forward did not take final form until it had been thoroughly discussed in genuine town-meeting fashion; and it is safe to say that seldom in the history of higher education in the United States has there been more effective 'team-work' than between President Walker and his devoted faculty."[18] Professor Munroe, the biographer, also says that one source of Walker's strength with his faculty "was his habit of visiting them in their offices, classrooms and laboratories at frequent intervals, of keeping in close touch with their methods and plans of work."[19]

But no instance of the relationship of a president to a faculty is more moving than is found in the association of President Gilman with his colleagues of Johns Hopkins. At the time of his resignation, after a quarter of a century spent in constructive service, the faculty, through Professor Gildersleeve, said:

"We who have been called, each in his sphere, to

[18] A Life of Francis Amasa Walker. By James Phinney Munroe. pp. 238-239.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 238.

carry out the details of the plans which you inaugurated, know, as others cannot know, the wisdom of your counsel, the readiness of your sympathy, the strength of your faith. Your unswerving confidence in the future of the University has done everything to stay the hearts of those who feared the worst from fortune. The liberality, which you could not always hide, has made many things possible, which we should have had to renounce; and the balance of your temper has harmonized the jar of conflicting interests and conflicting aims, inevitable in any great institution of learning."[20]

In a private letter, Professor Gildersleeve, not long before his death, wrote to me, saying:

"Months before the opening of the Johns Hopkins University, President Gilman did me the honor of unfolding to me in two long interviews his plans for the new institution. As the first professor of the University I was closely associated with him in the working out of those plans of far-reaching significance, and I have given expression to my appreciation of his large vision, notably in the address which I drew up in behalf of the faculty, some time before his withdrawal and at the memorial meeting following his death. Passing years have only heightened my admiration of his great services to the cause of higher education, his resourcefulness, tact, generosity, his rare skill in finding the currents of popular opinion,

[20] Life of Daniel Coit Gilman. By Fabian Franklin. pp. 386-387.

and in the direction of individual capacities and I regret that I can only reaffirm here, what I have already written concerning the achievements of him who led us so many years along paths which have become national landmarks."

In the relation of the president to the faculty is included either the fact or the appreciation of scholarship. Many college presidents of the first three-quarters of the last century were as able and eminent scholars as any one of their associates. President Quincy of Harvard, as President Eliot says, "was a man of property and a business man of large capacity."[21] But President Walker also says of him that "he was the best classical scholar of all the Presidents of Harvard up to his time."[22] Mark Hopkins of Williams, Seelye of Amherst, Walker of Harvard, Wayland of Brown, McCosh and Patton of Princeton were philosophers; Felton of Harvard and Wheeler of California were accomplished Greek scholars. Remsen of Hopkins and Smith of Pennsylvania were great chemists, Jordan of Leland Stanford, a biologist of wide-spread fame. Butler of Columbia and Hibben of Princeton were teachers of philosophy, Neilson of Smith, an English scholar of much renown.

Such presidents, being scholars themselves, would normally and naturally find themselves in heartiest

[21] Harvard Memories. By Charles W. Eliot. p. 46.

[22] Life of Josiah Quincy. By his son, Edmund Quincy. p. 488.

sympathy with their comrades who are members of the staff of teachers. But presidents who are not primarily scholars should yet be in heartiest fellowship with their colleagues. They should appreciate—appreciate keenly and deeply—the worth of scholars in and to their age and to their nation. They should not fail to recognize that the worth of teaching depends not only upon the spirit of the teacher, but also upon the foundation of truth upon which his teaching rests and from which it springs. They should understand the difficulties which their associates encounter in seeking to extend the boundaries of knowledge and to map out, with greater clearness, the field of learning. These difficulties, of a lack of material means and equipment and of want of leisure for the primary duties of research, as well as of teaching, they should seek to remove, or at least to lessen. They should not, and indeed they cannot, forget that characteristic diffidence of the college scholar and teacher in making known his wants, which is found in the fear that he may unduly trespass upon the rights of colleagues. In both the fact of scholarship and in the appreciation of scholarship, no more impressive example is found than that obtaining in the administration of President Woolsey of Yale. Woolsey was a scholar in domains as wide apart as Greek, political science, and international law. Of the administration of President Woolsey, his colleague and a successor, Dwight, has written: "That which especially

distinguished it in relation to the growth and development of the institution, was the higher ideal of scholarship which it introduced. It was this that gave it its prominence in the order of progress from the earlier days towards the later ones. Following, as it did, after what I have called the creative period, coincident with the first Presidency of the century, and also after the next era, when the principles and laws of the permanent Yale life were established, it seemed to have its place, as if by Providential arrangement, just where and when it was needed with reference to the true growth of the institution.'' [23-24]

[23] Memories of Yale Life and Men. By Timothy Dwight. p. 339.

[24] Of William Pepper, provost of the University of Pennsylvania, from 1881 to 1894, it is said: "Dr. Pepper was fond of men of helpful ideas,—practical people who could advance the cause in hand. The youngest man in the University, if he had useful ideas, was welcomed as a coadjutor. His profound knowledge of human nature enabled him to escape many of the pitfalls in the way of the ordinary college president. A member of the Faculty who could contribute ideas was as dear to him as one who could make a handsome subscription. He was fond of young men, and was accused of feeding them on promises. The fact was that the impoverished state of the University forbade adequate salaries. He himself always lived on expectation of plenty, and many a devoted man in the Faculty was quite satisfied to live with him in the same joyous hope. If, however, funds were secured, he was the first to apply them in a large reward for services rendered."—The Life of William Pepper, M.D., LL.D. By Francis Newton Thorpe, pp. 365-366.

In this relationship of sympathy is embodied what may be comprehensively called devotion. Devotion is a loyalty which both the faculty and the president feel to each other and to their college, and to the great causes which the college represents. This loyalty is not the feeling or the work of hired servants or of timeservers, but the love of a son for his home, rejoicing to sacrifice and to be sacrificed that the home may be enlarged and enriched. It is a devotion marked by patience, forbearance, fortitude, and quickened by highest ideals for a useful and lifelong career. The college may be a college small in numbers, and poor in its material treasures; but nevertheless it deserves and receives the richest offerings of such devotion; or it may be a college historic, large in numbers, amply endowed; yet its noblest endowment is the loyalty of professor and president. Of such devotion, academic annals give many examples. Such an example is found in Noah Porter, president of Yale, of whom it is said:

"Whatever any officer thought was essential to his usefulness, Dr. Porter was anxious to provide. He saw the peculiarities of men, and, though often amused at them, recognized the necessity of making allowance for these peculiarities. He met with quick response every good quality. He saw so much good in men and was so desirous that that good should have full scope, that it may safely be assumed that the constant demands on his time and assistance were met with much greater ease and exhausted him far

less, than if his kindness and love for men had been a superficial thing.'' [25]

At the centenary of Hamilton College, in 1912, Elihu Root, in a noble and filial historic interpretatation, said:

''I wish . . . to say something about the college that can be illustrated by reference to a group of teachers, who were here fifty years ago—my own father, Oren Root, and his son, Oren Root, who, in succession, filled the chair of mathematics in the college for fifty-eight years; Edward North, professor of Greek for forty-eight years; Charles Avery, for twenty-five years professor of chemistry; Christian Henry Frederick Peters, the astronomer for thirty-two years in the Litchfield Observatory; and Anson Judd Upson, for twenty-one years professor of rhetoric. Their students doubtless soon forgot the most of what they learned from book and lecture; but their students never could escape the deep and lasting impressions upon their characters, their tastes, and their intellectual methods. These professors were poor as the world goes, but they had a wealth that money cannot create. They loved their subjects and were happy in their work. They rejoiced in the exercise of their powers. They were content with simple pleasures. They filled the atmosphere about them with an enthusiasm for learning and literature. They sought for truth as one who strives in a game. They

[25] Noah Porter: President of Yale, A Memorial by Friends. Edited by George S. Merriam. pp. 141-142.

never talked or thought about money or investments or profits. They took little heed of all those things for which men are striving and wearing out their lives in the market places of a materialistic civilization.

"For a boy to live with such men, to be close to them during four of the most impressionable years of youth, to observe and become accustomed to their simple and sincere lives, without money, made happy by the pleasures of the intellect and taste, to get their standards and become impressed by their estimates of the values of life, and to learn enough out of books in the meantime to understand it all—that is an education beyond price." [26]

But in the relation of faculty and president, such sympathy, such mutual respect and devotion may not prove to be permanent. Antagonisms to the president arise. Opposition to his policies emerges. Personal dislikes may not be lacking. Breaches of good taste, narrowness of vision on his part, or on others' part too, misunderstandings of purposes, of means and of methods, misinterpretation of motives, are as liable to be created in the relationships of faculty and president, as in other relationships. Such are the perils besetting men of strong character, of firm opinions, and of mature judgments. Under such conditions, the president is to seek to embody at

[26] The Centenary of Hamilton College: Historical Address. By Elihu Root. June 17, 1912, Documentary History of Hamilton College. pp. 20-21.

least four elements or atmospheres. First, he is to represent an intellectual altruism which seeks to put himself into the place of those who criticise his policies and oppose his works. Second, he is to have a spirit of moral patience like that of Gorgas at Panama, being willing to wait for the emergence of conclusions. Third, he is to seek to be free from all blameworthiness. If he is guilty of offense or of offending, he is to confess and to try to mend his ways. In the years immediately succeeding the World War, such conditions seemed to be especially common and virulent. Fourth, he is, moreover, to exercise the force of administrative constructiveness. He is to bring forth fruits. All these forces are to be used in an atmosphere of courtesy and of graciousness. Such ways and moods will tend to remove antagonisms, in case it is right for antagonisms to cease.

A worthy example of the ideal relation of a president to the faculty is found in Raymond, president of Vassar:

"The deliberations of the Faculty have been conducted with unprecedented harmony and vigor, and with satisfactory results. It is cheering to the President, and full of happy augury to the institution, to see this body becoming more and more a unit and a power in the College, through an increasing spirit of mutual respect and a practical coincidence of views among the Professors, *which is all the more intelligent and the more likely to be permanent be-*

*cause it is reached through the freest and most earnest discussion.*" [27]

In contrast, as evil an instance of what the relation should not be, is found in the opposition of Moses Coit Tyler, both a gentleman and a scholar indeed, to Charles Kendall Adams, president of Cornell. In his diary (November, 1889) Tyler writes:

"The great incident of my life, since my return home [from abroad], is my break with President C. K. Adams. We are no longer friends—acquaintances merely. Perhaps I shall jot down some day the facts which have dissolved a very intimate relation, lasting nearly twenty years." [28] And again, two days later, he wrote, in making note of a faculty meeting: "Another of those painful scenes which have become so frequent under C. K. Adams's tactless rule. I felt real pity for this poor old pachyderm of a president, persistently reiterating the same old blunders and plunging forever into the quagmire deeper and deeper." [29] In December of the same year, he made an entry in his diary of a call from President Adams: "He was not at all at his ease; and gasped and floundered more than usual. I manifested no cordiality, but treated him with cool civility, and the conversation went on for an hour. I accompanied him to the door, and as he walked away he turned half around in an awkward sort of way as if

[27] Life and Letters of John Howard Raymond. p. 583.
[28] Moses Coit Tyler. By Jessica Tyler Austen. p. 249.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

expecting me to say some relenting word. Poor old pachyderm—befooling himself with the dream of being a Bismarck."[30] And yet again he writes: "Slept but little last night. Unfit for controversy and business; and a personal war, like this, is at war with my nature. [This has reference to relations with C. K. Adams.] Regrets and sad memories poured through my mind all night. But I am in the path of duty and must not flinch. I never was in a fight before; and I am not going out of this fight behind."[31] The next day, he said: "On my way to lecture I called on President Adams and arranged for Thursday evening [for a meeting of the Senate Committee]. Our interview was formal, cold, and, on his part, almost harsh."[32]

One is, however, not to fail to recognize that such oppositions are in a sense normal to human nature. The opposition to Washington from which he constantly suffered during his service, both as commander and as President, is of course notorious. Faction and malice tried to work their worst upon him.[33]

In this relation of president and faculty, one is not to fail to notice that antagonisms between professors themselves may be quite as marked and as destructive to the good order of a college as disagreements be

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 251.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 253.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 253.
[33] George Washington. By William Roscoe Thayer. p. 112.

tween the chief executive and his associates. That great founder, and wise interpreter of education, Andrew D. White, speaks of the evil with much feeling:

"This evil was the prevalence of feuds between professors. Throughout a large part of the nineteenth century they were a great affliction. Twice the State University of Michigan was nearly wrecked by them; for several years they nearly paralyzed two or three of the New York colleges; and in one of these a squabble between sundry professors and the widow of a former president was almost fatal. Another of the larger colleges in the same State lost a very eminent president from the same cause; and still another, which had done excellent work, was dragged down and for years kept down by a feud between its two foremost professors. In my day at Yale, whenever there was a sudden influx of students, and it was asked whence they came, the answer always was, 'Another Western college has burst up'; and the 'burst up' had resulted, almost without exception, from faculty quarrels.

"In another chapter I have referred to one of these explosions which, having blown out of a Western university the president, the entire board of trustees, and all the assistant professors and instructors, convulsed the State for years. I have known gifted members of faculties, term after term, substitute for their legitimate work impassioned appeals to their religious denominations, through synods or conferences, and to the public at large through the press,—their quar-

rels at last entangling other professors and large numbers of students."[34]

One of the chief developments in the college faculty of the last decades is the creation and the enlarging function of the office of the dean.[35] The office itself came originally from that of the monastery, and found its way into the Oxford and Cam-

[34] Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White. Vol. I. pp. 429-430.

[35] "The dean must be a man able to command the confidence of teachers and pupils. He must possess comprehensive insight into the work, strength, defects, and needs, both of his faculty as a whole and of each several department.

"If differences arise between faculty and students or between students and students, he is the arbiter. He devises means to improve the work, strengthening it here and there as he may, removing hindrances, suggesting adjustments, starting new procedures. Through the president and his fellow deans he helps co-ordinate the work of his faculty with that of the other faculties. Informing himself thereon, he takes part in the larger planning, the grand strategy, of the University government, and, so far as his own faculty is affected, sees that it joins in the general movement. Withal, each dean should, if it is possible without danger to his health, continue a teacher, working weekly, if not daily, in the classroom. As universities grow in size and presidents are forced to relinquish teaching, the dean becomes the main copula between the business and the scholastic phase of university activity."—The Organization of the University and the Distribution of Authority and Function Therein. By President E. B. Andrews, University of Nebraska. Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities in the United States of America, 1907. p. 120.

bridge colleges. Its function there was in part disciplinary. This function still continues, and has become enlarged.

At the present time, the dean of a college bears to the president the relation which the dean of a cathedral bears to the bishop of the diocese in which the cathedral is located. It is an office demanding an understanding of the young mind and heart, a delicacy in interpreting character, a prophetic element in seeking to look into the student's future, a restraining force to the overambitious, a quickening one to the depressed and the diffident, and always one of justice to the academic offender. It is also an office which requires accuracy in keeping records, and force as applied to college order, work and conditions. It is an office therefore having close relations to the office of the president, as well as to the student and teachers. [36] To him who fills it, the chief duty of the

[36] One of the earliest interpretations of the office was made in the first of the forty annual reports of President Eliot:

"It is his duty to preside at the meetings of the Faculty in the absence of the President; to administer the discipline of the College; to take charge of all petitions from undergraduates to the Faculty; to keep the records of admission and matriculation; to furnish such lists of students as may be required by the Faculty or the several teachers; to prepare all scales of scholarship, and preserve the records of conduct and attendance; to submit each year to the Faculty lists of persons to be recommended for scholarships and beneficiary aid, and likewise a list of those who appear, from the returns made to his office, to have complied with all the regular conditions for the degree of Bachelor of

president is the duty of trustfulness. The ablest man should be chosen to the office, and the president should entrust him with full power and give to him com-

Arts; and in general to superintend the clerical and administrative business of the College."—Annual Reports of Harvard College for 1869-1870. p. 12.

From this foundation, the office has been built into the structure of every college, and necessarily and worthily built.

Of the condition in Harvard, at the time President Eliot became the head of the University, he says:

"Now deans were rather recent creations in Harvard University. The Medical School had had a Dean since 1864; but his chief function was friendly and charitable intercourse with the students. Professor Gurney had just been appointed Dean of the College Faculty; but the nature of his functions and influence was not yet visible. Whether the functions of the Dean of the Law School were to be chiefly clerical and eleemosynary or not was not clear to Professors Washburn and Holmes; but at any rate neither of them desired the office."—A Late Harvest. By Charles W. Eliot. p. 47.

The office of the dean, however, is capable of abuse. The dean, like any other executive officer, may be foolish in judgment and arbitrary in action. Of this class, happily small, President G. Stanley Hall has said:

"University deans have often created rules which they themselves can suspend for individuals, and this has greatly augmented their power. It is they largely who have broken up knowledge into standardized units of hours, weeks, terms, credits, blocking every short cut for superior minds and making a bureaucracy which represses personal initiative and legitimate ambition."—Life and Confessions of a Psychologist. By G. Stanley Hall. p. 346.

But such a condition is exceptional. Competent deans are typical. Their competence is, I believe, even more typical than the competence of their superior officers.

plete confidence. If such confidence cannot be given or expected, a change in the office of either dean or president is made imperative. There should be no interference; no overriding is to be permitted. The wisdom of the dean should be wiser and his discretion more discreet, his decision more conclusive, than any wisdom, discretion, or decision, which his commanding officer may make. Such a policy as marked the administration of President Day of Yale in relation to his associates, should characterize the bearing of a president to the dean. That policy has been described by Dwight, who says; "He [Day] never used his official position and dignity in the way of interference with their individual duties or prerogatives. On the other hand, as Dr. Woolsey says of him, he always confided in their readiness to do their appropriate work on principle, and without supervision. This same generous treatment of those associated with him was characteristic of his predecessor in the chair of administration, and through the influence of the two men the idea of responsibility without interference was established as the Yale idea for the future." [37]

The wise president, in fact, is wise enough to know that a wise dean in his own sphere is wiser than he himself can be.

Before entering into an interpretation of the relation of the president to a third body, the students, I

[37] Memories of Yale Life and Men, 1845-1899. By Timothy Dwight. p. 45.

wish to consider the relation of the two bodies, trustees and faculty, to each other.

The board of trustees and the faculty are the two most fundamental elements of the university or college. The relation contains many elements of alliance, and of sympathy, and also of antagonism. They are allied as being, alike, officers of a single association or corporation. They are allied in the interpretation which the public makes of the mutuality of their rights, honors, duties, responsibilities. They are allied in devotion to a comprehensive, fundamental aim, the education of youth and the promotion of knowledge. But they are in peril of antagonisms, or at least of occupying different points in their academic understanding and in their recognition of academic procedure. The board of trustees is concerned primarily with the business administration, with the increase, safety, and remunerativeness of investments, real or intangible, and with responsibilities for the making and keeping of contracts and the meeting of all obligations. Duties of the utmost significance belong to them. Under such conditions, the board of trustees is subject to certain perils. One peril is that, in their regard for the means of education, they forget the ultimate end of education. Another peril is that they are liable to give the impression of remoteness of interest, of absenteeism, in mind and heart, from the college. It has been said that the board of trustees is prone to treat the members of the faculty as employees and not as scholars and

teachers through whom the real service of the college to the community is given. On the other hand, the faculty is prone to think only of the end of the college, the education of students and the promotion of research, and to have small regard for the administrative means for securing the end. Often have I heard members of a faculty declare, "I have no interest in the financial side of the college! Money matters are the concern of the trustees. I don't care at all about them!" Professors are indeed, as President Chadbourne used to say, "the college," yet they should have sympathy with the struggles of a board of trustees to get funds to promote its enlarging power and growing usefulness.

One of the more lamentable instances of the harm wrought by the separateness of the two bodies is found in Clark University of Worcester, in the middle of the second decade of the present century. In the establishment of a new school, indeed an important one, the trustees failed to take the faculty into their coöperative confidence. The foundation was "a difficult and venturesome educational venture." For, the venture represented the abandonment of the policy of giving strength to departments already established before establishing new ones. It also broke the continuity of the development of a unique educational experiment. The financial and scholarly importance of the new foundation, the ignorance of the teaching staff regarding its establishment, and the methods of the administration attending its installation, created

a sad, even if a temporary, separateness of the two controlling bodies, disintegrating for a time to the whole university.

The current remoteness of sympathy and the diversity of interpretation of coördinate functions should so far as possible be removed. To secure this removal, I believe it is well for certain members of the faculty to be made members of the board of trustees. There are reasons, however, against such a procedure. For, as one of their fundamental duties, trustees determine salaries for the teaching staff. It is unbecoming for members of the teaching staff to determine their own salaries. Furthermore, not infrequently trustees wish, and properly wish, to discuss intimate questions of the internal administration, without the presence of members of the faculty who may themselves become the subject of discussion. Yet, on the whole, the arguments for such membership are weightier than the objections. In Cornell University [38] and Western Reserve, certain members

[38] "The University Faculty is authorized and invited to select delegates who shall represent it in the Board of Trustees. Said representatives shall not at any time exceed three in number. They and their successors shall be selected by ballot and for such terms respectively as shall be fixed by the Faculty. They shall have the right to meet with the Board of Trustees and the Committee on General Administration and shall possess the usual powers of Trustees except the right to vote.

"A professor emeritus, or a professor on leave of absence, who has been elected by the University Faculty as one of its representatives on the Board of Trustees shall be

of the faculty sit in the meetings of the trustees, without, in some cases, the right to vote. Other members possess full rights. Sympathy, both personal and administrative, is thus created and promoted. It is also well for the promotion of fellowship to give the members of the faculty a share in the making of appropriations in the annual budget. For, the salary which a teacher receives is of vital consequence to himself and to his family. In the annual budget, the item of the cost of instruction covers about one-half of the expense. The amount which can be appropriated for meeting the cost of instruction is always far less than the merits of the instruction warrant. Salaries, therefore, are necessarily made smaller than those who receive them believe is fitting. It is a bit more easy, however, for a professor to determine that his own stipend should be small than to accept a stipend of like small amount imposed upon him by a third party,—the budget committee of the board of trustees. Logically it does not belong to a faculty to make up a budget, but as a form of wholesome administration, I believe it is well for a faculty to have a share in its preparation. For, as President Butler says, in his annual report for Columbia's year of 1923-24:

"The budget problem is not only one of finance,

deemed, during the time he is such a representative, a member of the University Faculty without vote, although relieved of all departmental duties."—Amended Statutes of Cornell University, Article VIII, Sections 6 and 7.

but one of human feeling and human relationship. In the financial administration of a university mere monetary considerations must always and everywhere take second place. A university, however large its endowment, is neither a bank, an investment company, nor a manufacturing corporation aiming to pay dividends and to show gains. It is primarily and always a company of human beings bent upon the pursuit of the highest ends by the finest and most disinterested means. The needs and the aspirations of that company come first; everything else comes second."

By these two methods, of a representation of the faculty on the board of trustees and by giving to a faculty certain rights and duties in the doing of that most important business, the preparation of the annual budget, remoteness of the board of trustees from the faculty, and indifference of the faculty to the board, may be somewhat, if not largely, eliminated.

Yet, it has been urged that these two bodies should be constituted as one, and that the one should be the faculty. It is argued that all legal conditions, responsibilities, and forces should be vested in the faculty. It should be made the body, corporate and sole, it is affirmed.

In favor of such a unity, I find two or three considerations. The first is the English usage. In Oxford and Cambridge, and their respective colleges, the fellows and their immediate associates perform many of the functions allotted in American institutions to

the board of trustees. It is impossible, without entering into many and diverse details, to indicate the duties of such bodies, but suffice it to say that the historical interpretation of the past is clear. The second consideration lies in the interest, deep and natural, which members of the teaching staff take, or should take, in the material and fiscal concerns of the university, in which they are the real working force. Reasons personal, scholastic, domestic, for the immediate hour and for the future years, create and nourish that interest. Against constituting the faculty the board of trustees, however, the reasons are strong, and to my mind stronger. The value of the English method as applied to American conditions, is far less than the allusion would warrant. For no small share of the funds of the Oxford and Cambridge colleges are invested in land, a form which requires less care for the security of the original investment than bonds or stocks.

A strong positive reason, moreover, against professorial control of funds lies in the most obvious fact that the making of investments is one of the most difficult and delicate of all works. It represents understanding of business conditions,—industrial, communal, mercantile. It presupposes an appreciation, too, of the moral risks involved in the care and conduct of business. It involves prophetic interpretations, as well as insights of the immediate present. It demands wise judgment and keenest perceptions touching all fiscal movements. Such elements do not,

and cannot, by reason of their training and profession, normally belong to college professors. College professors are not as a body fitted to perform the functions of investors of large funds.

The second reason lies in a broader field. It relates to the English and American method of installing in public service and similar corporations, a non-expert body, a body functioning between the people who are served and the expert body which gives service. Illustrations are found in many fields. The cabinet of the President of the United States has a Secretary of War, but he is not usually a West Point graduate,—a Secretary of the Navy, but he is not usually a graduate of Annapolis, or of the Naval College at Newport. Every bank has a board of directors, but its members are not usually bankers. Every railroad has a board of directors, but its members are not versed in the technique of the complex process of transportation. The chief officers of several of the greatest industrial companies do not at all know the technical methods of making steel or iron. Such officers are chosen indeed for their breadth of understanding, for their appreciation of relations, for their ability in securing general adjustments. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy command expert counsel, but do not take on themselves the giving of expert service. The directors of banks, of railroads, of industrial corporations give general judgments on technical propositions which are to be viewed in the light of fundamental facts, of movements and tendencies, and of

ultimate results. The technical work is done by technicians.

A similar condition obtains in circles academic. The professorial staff is the expert body, the teaching force, the research staff. It is not legislative or executive. It is the real force, however, which runs the academic machine. Between it and the people whom it serves stands the board of trustees interpreting general movements, tendencies, conditions, and forces.

To one further element against constituting the faculty the board of trustees, allusion should be made. It is the fact that, whether able or unable to perform the duties of trustees, the professors of a college or university are not by the people *regarded* as able. On the contrary, people are inclined to regard professors —of course with exceptions—as not fitted, either by training or by calling, to perform duties demanding expert financial knowledge and disciplined financial experience. Such an impression would directly act in deterring donors from entrusting gifts or bequests for endowment to a body thus regarded. Donors usually study with care the financial ability, as well as the moral integrity, of academic corporations to which they propose to offer trusts. Academic corporations are obliged to meet tests quite as severe as those which banks are obliged to meet in soliciting deposits. Even if college professors, made into boards of trust, could well bear such tests, it is yet true that many proposing donors of funds, either large or small, do not so interpret the ability of a college faculty.

In the relation which the president bears to both the trustees and the faculty is an element, simple and narrow indeed, which touches both these bodies. It is the ability of the president to preside at their meetings. For such presiding is usually one of the functions of the president. The typical meeting, commanding his service, is of a relatively small body,—of a board of trustees seldom consisting of less than seven, and seldom of a larger number than thirty-five members, and of a faculty and of its committees. This faculty may be likewise of a small number or it may be of seventy or even a hundred or more members. Of the fundamental elements of a proper presiding, perhaps the following are the more important: an orderly arrangement of the business to be presented; a facile presentation of this business; an understanding of the relation of the different agenda of a meeting; an understanding of the relation of the business of any one meeting to the business of other meetings, already held or to be held; a pleasant manner; a flavor of wit and of humor; a sense of sympathetic appreciation of each member of the board or staff; a just and generous judgment of the value of a member's remarks; an evident devotion to the organization which one serves.

As a rule, college executives are good presiding officers. Their general fault is allowing the business of a meeting to drag along its slow and weary length. Debate is prone to become vapid, aimless, ineffective. Yet peremptoriness and arbitrariness are far worse

than slowness. Of course, too, the ways and manners of the presiding officer of a body of a thousand should not, and need not, obtain in a meeting of a hundred or of twenty-five members.

An admirable example of the relation of the president to the board of trustees and of the faculty, and the relation of these two bodies to each other, is found in Dartmouth College. A joint committee of both bodies considers appointments, promotions, and many other important matters of common interest. In such a matter even as conferring honorary degrees, a field in which trustees, or a committee thereof, or a president alone, is prone to take decisive action, the faculty is consulted. And such consultation is most fitting. A certain, and latent, irritation is thus avoided. For a faculty is inclined to regard itself, as it ought, as responsible for the validity of all degrees, honorary as well as those given in course.

### 3. The Students

To a third body the president holds a relation which, in certain aspects, is more important than that obtaining in respect to trustees or to faculty, to wit,—the relation which he bears to the body for which the college really exists, the students.

To the students the president should present certain qualities in his surroundings and should embody certain elements in his character which have a value most precious.

The most obvious quality in his surroundings relates

to the freedom and ease of approach. It is well for the president's office to be one which may be entered with the greatest facility and felicity. Let not the entrance to his room, or rooms, be guarded by secretaries or orderlies. Let him have a public office, with recourse to an inner sanctum or private room. One large single office allows sufficient privacy and tends to shorten the unnecessary length of calls. To this office let the freshman, in his first week, feel that he has a right to come, and let him realize that the president wants him, either with or without special business, to come. Such was the habit of President Walker of the Institute of Technology. It is said of him: "His desk was across the room and facing the door; and thus he sat during office hours with the door wide open, ready to talk with anyone who chose to come in. Any other administrator of equal importance would have been in an inner chamber at the end of two or three others, with a secretary or two, to keep people away from him."[39] To the president, the freshman is really the most important man on the campus, as he probably is to the freshman. Of such a generous type was Barrows, formerly and briefly president of the University of California, a university at times one of the largest, if not the largest, in point of attendance, of the universities of the world. The demands on its president were and still are diverse, heavy, constant,—demands so onerous that no one can

[39] A Life of Francis Amasa Walker. By James Phinney Munroe. pp. 245-246

meet them with satisfaction to himself. Yet a door, for at least an hour of each day, was Barrows holding open to welcome each caller.

A characteristic of the president, touching the students, more important than environment, refers to the mood of friendliness. This mood is, of course, real with most officers. Of one, and of only one, president could it be said—and he is no longer living—that he wanted a man to "chew up" every morning before breakfast. But this mood of friendliness, of course always possible, should be made most apparent. The great Rowland of Johns Hopkins was once asked: "And what do you do with your students?" "Neglect them," was his reply. Such a reply would not rest fittingly on the lips of a president even in humor. Indifference, remoteness, aloofness, coldness, should be repressed. Warmth, sympathy, appreciation, fellowship, should be the method and the mood. Such was the method of Jowett: "There were, of course, men who never came under his influence, but on the majority he exercised a powerful attraction, and to many he became the chief friend of their lives. . . . He was like no other person; one whose life 'retaught what life should be,' a saint without asceticism, moving in a world of truth and purity and wisdom; and in a world of strength too, for with him sympathy did not spell weakness. . . . It is true that he sometimes bore with the weaknesses of men to an extent which was thought unwise, but he did so in the hope of inspiring them with new strength; he never cast a man off so

long as he had any hope of him. He did not like to acknowledge a failure on his own part, and his belief in the possibility of improvement, where there was any moral vitality at all, was boundless." [40]

Of course, apparent coldness or even harshness may hide a warm, sympathetic heart. Yet it is a misfortune that harshness, even in impression, should prevail. One of the greatest presidents of Harvard College was Josiah Quincy. Of him, the revered Dr. Andrew P. Peabody says:

"In his intercourse with the students, Mr. Quincy lacked the suavity of address that had distinguished his predecessor, but possessed no less of genuine kindness. He was abrupt, almost harsh, in manner. He seldom remembered a face; and when a student—even one sent for but a few moments before—entered his study, he was encountered by the question: 'What's your name?' So much was this his habit, that if it so happened, in a rare instance, that he did recognize a countenance, he was more likely than not to say, 'Well, Brown, what's your name?' But he knew intimately well the character, history, and belongings of the individual students, as their names stood in the catalogue; and his constant aim with regard to them was, not only to do justice, but to show that mercy which is the better part of justice." [41]

[40] Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett. By Evelyn Abbott and Lewis Campbell. Vol. II. p. 437.

[41] Harvard Reminiscences: Josiah Quincy. By Andrew Preston Peabody. p. 33.

Of the great Robinson of Brown, it is said in a somewhat opposite spirit:

"Spite of the generous aid which young men in college continually received from him, often out of his own pocket, and though not a few of his pupils were admitted to a warm and genial friendship with him which they will forever cherish as among the richest results of their life at college, the majority even of those under his immediate instruction regarded him more with awe than with affection. This was doubtless due in part to the President's rather stern way of dealing with students. He was an autocrat, accustomed to command and to receive obedience. He seemed to feel it his duty to teach collegians subordination, and to hold them at some distance. His most enthusiastic college pupils agree that this habit greatly hindered his success in drawing ingenuous young men near to him in order to mould their thinking and purposes, in which, however, he grandly succeeded with many." [42]

President Angell, writing, near the close of his rich life, upon his experiences while at the head of the University of Vermont, says:

"It gave me peculiar pleasure from my intimate personal acquaintance with each pupil and in many cases with his parents. Since I also taught every one in more than one branch, I was able to guide and impress them all, to direct their reading and writing

[42] Ezekiel Gilman Robinson: An Autobiography. Edited by E. H. Johnson. p. 277.

and help shape their character and their plans, as would have been quite impossible in a large institution. The relations thus established between me and them have been a source of permanent gratification to me and I trust to not a few of them." [43]

In this element of friendliness a chief place is to be given to the sense of hopefulness for a student. Most students are prone to be in fear and anxiety for their future. Many are inclined at times to believe that a failure in career and life is their doom. They think themselves unable to meet the expectation of friends. They feel that they are not worth the sacrifice which the home is making to give them an education. Of course, there are students of just the opposite type,—vain, self-conceited, self-glorious, bumptious. To them the president is to be a restraining force, even if not an humiliating influence. But the men who need encouragement and quickening are far more common. The president has much more reason to speak words of hopefulness than of foreboding. It is said of President Porter of Yale:

"His disposition led him to believe in the possibilities of good that were open for all, and thus to treat them in a hopeful way. . . . He had in his nature also a larger measure of the optimistic character, which has confidence that results will prove better than the present circumstances may seem to indicate, and will prove thus even if we do not ourselves

[43] The Reminiscences of James Burrill Angell. p. 126.

intervene to direct the progress of events toward them." [44]

To the student, the president should also embody the element of intellectual and moral honesty. He should be regarded as being absolutely square. Students prefer the officer who is square and hard, rather than the one who is soft and circuitous. Wayland himself said of his own administration:

"It was . . . my aim to have no laws which could not be shown to be perfectly reasonable, and then to execute those laws with all possible strictness and impartiality." [45]

"It must be distinctly understood that when these have proved ineffectual, punishment will come, and come on all alike, without the shadow of partiality." [46]

Of course, with the virtue of squareness may be, and ought to be, joined that indefinite quality which is called tact. Tact is simply the possession of the quality of the gentleman. It stands for intellectual altruism, mental understanding. It means emotional sensitiveness, and also a hope, touching the student, of personal future achievement. It means an appreciation of conditions and an action based on such conditions. It stands for seeing things in proper relations, and for a conduct and bearing properly arising from such a seeing.

[44] Memories of Yale Life and Men, 1845-1899. By Timothy Dwight. p. 344.

[45] Francis Wayland. By James O. Murray. p. 68.

[46] *Ibid.* pp. 68-69.

Accompanying these qualities of approachableness, friendliness, hopefulness, honesty, tact, and other elements, the president also should be and should represent richness in personality. Of course, it is impossible to define personality. But its place, worth, and power in the life of students, it is also impossible to overestimate. Examples of such power come trooping to the pen. An illustrious instance is found in the life and career of Alice Freeman Palmer. Of her, her husband quotes one of her students as saying:

"A great reason for her strange control of girls was, I think, that she always seized on some good point in a girl's character, emphasized that, and made the girl feel that she must bring the whole up to the level of this. She took for granted, or appeared to do so, the girl's good intentions. Many a time I have heard her say with the greatest apparent confidence to some wavering girl: 'Of course you couldn't do anything in this matter that is untrue or unladylike. That would be quite out of keeping with you.' And the wavering girl was promptly strengthened in her determination to do the right thing at any cost. The same method was worked in intellectual ways. My friend Miss M. returned to Wellesley after a four years' absence, hoping to complete her course in a year. The advanced requirements made this difficult. She talked over the situation with Miss Freman, feeling greatly discouraged before the interview. Miss Freeman sketched out the hard necessary work and said, 'Now, Miss M., that is what I call a

stiff schedule; but with your habits it is possible enough.' Miss M. went out determined not to disappoint her confidence, and she did not." [47]

And another student has said:

"Mrs. Palmer had a strange effect on me. When I saw her, I felt as if I could do things that I never dreamed of before. Even now, whenever I think of her, I have a sense of dignity in my life. I don't know what it is. It seems as if her appreciation of the worth of things puts a spirit into me that carries me along until the next time I think of her. I shouldn't care to go on in a world in which she hadn't been." [48]

President Andrews of Brown—familiarly called "Benny" Andrews—had a similar power over his students. His successor, President Faunce, has said to me that, inquiring of a graduate, once, who was declaiming of the power of Andrews over him, he asked, "What was it in Andrews that made this power?" The graduate replied, "I did not see much of Andrews, but he profoundly influenced me." "How, what was the occasion?" was a further question. "I once met Andrews on the walk," said the graduate. "He called me by my name and bade me 'good morning,' lifting his hat. It changed my whole life!" The story of Andrews illustrates the value of personality. It was not the "Good morning, Mr. Smith."

[47] The Life of Alice Freeman Palmer. By George Herbert Palmer. p. 144.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

The salutation was only the visible and outward sign of a regard and allegiance formed through years of association and of experience. President Shanklin, of Wesleyan, possessed a similar power. He knew not a few of his boys by their first name. The informality promoted the influence of the older over the younger man, and also made the question of academic discipline of very slight importance. The students of Smith College had a similar sense of reverence and of affection for President Seelye. Happy the president who, in naturalness, can be thus intimate with, and therefore helpful to, his students. That secret was possessed, also, by President Maclean of Princeton, of whom it is said he "never rebuked a student without making him a friend."[49] The meetings, too, which McCosh, Maclean's successor, held in his library, in his house, in which papers were read on philosophic subjects, which students remember with gratitude, got no small share of their stimulating effects from the personal influence of the beloved president himself.

One of the historic examples of a happy relationship of a president to his students is found in an interpretation which Asquith gives of the life of Jowett of Balliol. The interpretation was given soon after Jowett's death. Asquith says:

"He had none of the vulgar marks of a successful leader either of thought or action. He founded no school; nor was he the author or the apostle of any

[49] The Life of James McCosh. Edited by William Milligan Sloane. p. 192.

system, constructive or even critical. In a sense it is true that he left behind him no disciples; and to those who think that no man can stamp his impress upon his generation unless he is either a dogmatist or a partisan, his career will be a constant puzzle. But to us who knew him and saw him in the daily life of the College, the secret of his power is no mystery. We cannot hope to see again the counterpart of that refined and fastidious mind, in whose presence intellectual lethargy was stirred into life, and intellectual pretentiousness sank into abashed silence. Still less can we hope to see a character such as his; the union of worldly sagacity with the most transparent simplicity of nature; an intelligence keen and unsleeping, but entirely detached, and absorbed in the fortunes of a great institution and its members. Upon his generosity no call could be too heavy; with his delicate kindliness he was ever ready to give the best hours of either the day or the night to help and to advise the humblest of those who appealed to him for aid.''[50]

There are a few American college presidents of whom a similar interpretation could be made. Would that the number were greater, far, far greater!

Of course, the president will not be ''all things to all men,'' or the same thing to all men. Such conduct is supineness. He will rather seek to be the proper thing to each man. Indeed, he will strive to hold proper relations to the various classes of students.

[50] Occasional Addresses, 1893-1916. By the Right Honorable H. H. Asquith. pp. 164-165.

The wise dean of the University of Illinois, Thomas Arkle Clark, well describes these classes by the phrases, the "borrower," the "grafter," the "politician," the "cribber," the "athlete," the "loafer," the "fusser."[51] To each student of each class of students, the president, like the dean, administers admonition or encouragement, as each seems to require, and as the conditions allow. Considerateness is ever to be commended, and for both intellectual and ethical reasons. Campbell-Bannerman, in a speech made in 1907, quoted his friend, Wilfred Lawson, as saying, "The man who walks on a straight road never loses his way." The remark is quite as applicable to a college president, as to a prime minister.

The student of the college is not simply an individual. He is one of and with many. The life of the college is a highly organized and complex life. Its organizations number hundreds of clubs and societies. Indeed, fraternities or sororities form about one-half of the whole number. The self-governing associations of students are the most inclusive and representative of all the undergraduate bodies. They serve, and usually serve well, to regulate many informal affairs. They are also a sort of prophetic training school in fundamental human relationships. To all such societies, the president holds relations. The elements of these relations are, on his part, understanding without intrusiveness, sympathy without either softness or hardness, leadership without au-

[51] Discipline and the Derelict. By Thomas Arkle Clark.

tocracy, intimacy of association while maintaining the full respect of student, and of officer for student.

Another duty of the president, not usually recognized and failing to be recognized by reason of his having so few opportunities to exercise it, lies in his sense for the discovery of intellectual "sports." Such diversions from type, wherever and whenever occurring, are of the greatest value to intellectual progress and achievement. Such pioneers are liable to suffer neglect and are sometimes despised, even contemned. They may be found in the realm of metaphysical thought, as in the case of Charles S. Peirce, or in the chemical and other sciences, as in the case of Morley. But for them, and in every subject, the president is to be on the constant lookout. They may appear when and where least expected. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." But no one should be more eager to find them, or more able to give them large opportunities when they are found, than the college president. The greater is the need of watchfulness on the part of both the professor and the president by reason of the increasing desire of students to avoid giving evidence of exceptional ability. Perhaps also the other desire grows for avoiding evidence of exceptional stupidity. Scholastic mediocrity is a peril. Most students prefer the common grade of C, standing about half way between the grade of A and the grade of D. The gregarious instinct in demanding the common and the usual in scholarship is strong. Excep-

tional talent is prone to be dumb in classrooms, and also elusive. The president needs to be keen of eye and of ear, and apprehensive of every token, in order to select men of promise.

The relationship of the president to each of these bodies, the trustees, the faculty, and the students, which I have considered, are comprehensively and succinctly summed up in the interpretation given by one who is justly regarded as the greatest of presidents of his generation:

"There are no real grounds for any conflict between sound administrative policy in the university, on the one hand, and professorial interests, or students' interests, on the other. The primary object of university administration is to bring together the best possible body of capable, enthusiastic, and well-equipped teachers, and the largest possible body of appropriately trained, healthy, and ambitious students, and to let them react on each other in freedom. This is the teaching function of a university. The second object of university administration is to promote literary and scientific productiveness in the staff and among the advanced students. Success in this undertaking depends on the individual gifts and working powers of the teachers that the university has assembled, and on the amount of money that the university can afford to spend on research. This is the research function of a university. In neither of these fields of activity is there a place for a university despot of any sort, or for a narrow-minded

administrator, who chooses precipitately a way of his own, and then wants to have his way.

"University presidents, being accustomed to consider and promote, without any personal bias, the interests of varied departments of instruction or of their own institutions, and of the schools from which their students come, are easily drawn to the study of other public interests, particularly those of a social or educational character. By a natural development they become publicists and useful advisers on the educational and social aspects of legislation and governmental administration.

"The work of a good university president is selective, consultive, and cooperative; he works as a leading member, now of one group and now of another; he has no use for arbitrary power, for he can effect nothing without the cooperation of other devoted servants and friends of the institution; among his colleagues, the professors, he is the disinterested promoter of their interests, so far as they are consistent in his judgment with the general interests of the university and of the higher education, which all admit should be supreme; he is the best type yet evolved of the democratic executive officer who has long tenure, enjoys public consideration, and can put all his powers to noble uses. It is natural and right that he should have been evolved in the broad field of education.

"As the American people learn gradually how to secure good administrative service in their industries

and governments, executive positions are created which have tenures, functions, and powers analogous to those of university presidents. Thus, the long-service heads of the numerous commissions and boards of trustees which regulate industries, railroads, and other public utilities, and manage libraries, hospitals, asylums, religious and charitable associations, and public reservations, have often within the last forty years illustrated the same method in public or semi-public administrations which the universities have illustrated in their presidencies; and it is clear that the method has justified itself and secured public approbation." [52]

### 4. The Graduates

The student becomes a graduate. From the commencement platform, having received his diploma, "rightly signed and sealed," he steps forth into a lasting relation of sonship to his college. He has become a permanent member of a brotherhood who call their college, *Alma Mater*. He is recognized also as a member of a society of scholars.

The relation of the graduate to his college has increased in importance within the last score of years, and especially in the last half-decade. This relationship represents a body of alumni organized into closer compactness, of stronger forcefulness, exercising a

[52] The University President in the American Commonwealth. By Charles W. Eliot. Educational Review, Vol. XLII, Dec., 1911. pp. 448-449.

greater variety of functions, and having a deeper interest in the welfare of their college. The alumni associations, or graduate clubs, which all students form in cities, in counties, in states, and in foreign countries, are fitting tokens of enduring affection, and offer evidence of valuable academic service both given and to be given. In certain associations, established in the larger cities, meetings are held each week. In others, annual meetings represent the more normal custom. Of course, preëminently the interest is based on the worth of the education which the graduate has received, upon the personal and academic influences which have entered into his life, helping to make his character, and upon the enduring affiliations which the four years of college experiences have helped to create. Graduates recognize that the college has kept them, as Jowett used to say, "from making such a mess of life."

Of the value of the relation of the alumni to the college, President Porter of Yale has said:

"It is most fortunate that . . . the colleges have always had one resource. They have usually been able to rely upon their own graduates. These act as *internuncii* between the colleges and the public whenever there is occasion for explanation or danger of misunderstanding. In times of a conflict between the two, the alumni of a powerful college are, indeed, as 'arrows in the hand of a mighty man.' 'Happy is the "college" that hath its quiver full of them; *they shall speak with the enemies in the gate.*' The grad-

uates of the American colleges are their glory and their strength. They are their *glory,* so far as they show, by mental power, by varied acquirements, and accomplished culture, what their *Alma Mater* has done for them, either by her unwelcome restraints and hard duties, or by those influences that were more genial in their operation and are more delightful in the remembrance. They are their *strength,* so far as they are distinctly conscious of the benefits which they derived from the college, and are forward to acknowledge them. The colleges of this country have nothing to fear, so long as the majority of their pupils continue to confide in their systems of discipline and instruction, and in the men who administer them. While it is true that colleges and universities, all the world over, are objects of special regard to those whom they have trained, the colleges of America have the strongest conceivable hold upon the affections of their pupils, from the strength of the associations which are here fixed and interwoven, as well as from the sense of the value of the discipline here received. These alumni, it is true, retain and liberally exercise the traditional privileges of all children, freely to criticize the ways of the household. They retain vivid recollections of the tedium of many of the college tasks, and the unwelcome character of some of its discipline. Nor do they always weigh the import of what they say, or are they always entirely confident of the justice of the criticisms which they unthinkingly utter. Sometimes their fault-finding is

but the result of their jealous regard for the honor of their college and an indirect expression of the fervor of their zeal for its more abundant prosperity."[53]

In recent years, both as cause and result, at least four influences, or forces, have united to deepen the relations which the alumni hold to their college. The first is the right of graduates to elect or at least to nominate representatives of themselves to the board of trustees. This right, in certain instances, has been vested, directly and fully, in the whole body of alumni. In other cases the election has been made by the board itself on the nomination of graduates. In some cases, election of graduates has been made by the board of its own initiative. However secured, the result is, of course, the chief value. For alumni have a unique knowledge of the inside conditions of their college. They have scholarly appreciations of, and a personal affection for, *Alma Mater,* above those regnant outside the gateway. They are also among the best interpreters of the relation of a college to the community, local or general, which it serves. Yet, graduates, as organized into associations, are open to the peril of attempting to dominate the trustees or the faculty respecting matters of internal administration. They should not indeed seek, as some have sought, to remove professors from their chairs, or to attempt to legislate, as some have attempted, concerning the

[53] The American Colleges and the American Public. By Noah Porter. pp. 243-244.

details of the president's office. They should, indeed, feel free to offer intimations regarding the conduct of their beloved college. But they should also recognize that theirs is not the positive and actual responsibility for its administration. They should indeed feel that they are sons, but not the heads of the house.

A second cause contributing to the enlarging of the place and power of graduates lies in the establishment and growth of alumni clubs and associations throughout the country and even the world. Universities have scores of such societies, found in every American city, and in many foreign cities, from Singapore to Tokio, from Tokio to London and Paris, and from Paris to Buenos Aires. These associations are the rallying and radiating points of affection for the old college home.

The third cause, also a result, is the increasing dependence of the college on its graduates for financial support. In the "drives" of the last years, the graduates have had the largest part, both in the planning and in the actual securing of gifts.

The fourth cause, somewhat less intimate, lies in the growth and power of the Greek letter fraternities and sororities. These organizations are graduate, as well as undergraduate, institutions. They serve to ally and to associate both the former and the present members in all interests and activities. These dependent relations, both as cause and result, are indicated in the fraternity and alumni magazines and

similar publications sent forth, every week, or month, or quarter. They are numbered by the hundreds. They serve important functions, personal and institutional. They are usually both historical and personal, anticipatory, and often critical.

To the large and constantly enlarging, and always able body of graduates, the president bears relations both general and particular. These relations are primarily those of continued regard and affection. The president's peculiar duties to the former members of his college have ceased. But his regard for these boys and girls has not ceased, and never will, never can, cease. He follows his academic son or daughter over all lands, through all the years, and into every experience. He has a deep-down wish, and will, that life shall give the best to them, and that they shall give the best to life. In this respect, the small college offers advantages to its president apparently denied to the president of a large university. This continued regard opens the door for conferences and for personal associations, wherever and whenever the old graduate and the president may chance to find themselves together. Andrew D. White says:

"In all parts of the country alumni associations were organized, and here again I found a source of strength. These associations held reunions during every winter, and at least one banquet, at which the president of the university was invited to be present. So far as possible, I attended these meetings, and

made use of them to strengthen the connection of the graduates with their alma mater.'' [54]

Dr. McCosh also says:

''I think I may claim to have taken great pains to keep our graduates in close connection with the college. I have set up a great many alumni associations (there are in all eighteen), and have often visited them, traveling hundreds and some years thousands of miles for this purpose, and reporting the state of the college as I went along. I have enjoyed these meetings with the graduates, and have returned with a most valuable knowledge of what the community expects of the college. I proposed, several years ago, that the alumni should have authority to appoint an advisory committee, with power to give recommendations to the Board of Trustees, and to enter any classroom. The proposal was not adopted. It may come up in some future year.'' [55]

After twenty-five years of service as president of Johns Hopkins, the great Gilman retired. An impressive moment of the exercises attending his retirement was found in the presentation, through Woodrow Wilson, of an address of affection and congratulation, which bore the signatures of more than a thousand of the alumni and faculty. The first words of the address are:

[54] Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White. Vol. I. p. 431.

[55] The Life of James McCosh. Edited by William Milligan Sloane, pp. 211-212.

"We, Members of the Johns Hopkins University, upon this the occasion of your laying down the burdens of your high office, greatly desiring to make formal acknowledgment of our personal obligation to you, unite in a common testimonial of our respect, our gratitude, and our affection.

"We believe that the services which you have rendered to education have not been surpassed by those of any other American. If it be true that Thomas Jefferson first laid the broad foundation for American universities in his plans for the University of Virginia, it is no less true that you were the first to create and organize in America a university in which the discovery and dissemination of new truth were conceded a rank superior to mere instruction and in which the efficiency and value of research as an educational instrument were exemplified in the training of many investigators. In this, your greatest achievement, you established in America a new and higher university ideal, whose essential feature was not stately edifices nor yet the mere association of pupils with learned and eminent teachers, but rather the education of trained and vigorous young minds through the search for truth under the guidance and with the coöperation of master-investigators,—*societas magistrorum et discipulorum.*" [56]

The great master of Balliol, too, illustrates lasting interest in graduates:

[56] The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman. By Fabian Franklin. pp. 388-389.

"He would occupy himself with the placing of tablets in the Chapel to the memory of distinguished members of the College. About these and the inscriptions to be placed on them, he took the greatest pains . . . 'I hope before I die,' he said, 'to secure memorials within the College for all the distinguished members of it.' With the same object he was always endeavouring to obtain portraits of old members of the College." [57]

One of the happy lessons which the president learns is that college boys and girls, after a decade, or two score years, amount to so much more than their undergraduate days promised. Of course, there are to be found those who prove to be, to their friends, no less than to themselves, disappointments. Of course, too, there are instances of early ripeness which were a foreboding of correspondingly early decay. But, in general, the testimony is strong and clear. College graduates go far beyond their undergraduate promise. The academic mid-day is brighter and the afternoon finer than the academic dawn betokened. As Eliot says:

"As each Class grows older, the surviving members are drawn nearer together, and the more interesting becomes the comparison of careers, experiences, achievements, and services. Several Harvard Classes have undertaken to make photographic albums in which the portrait of each member at graduation

[57] Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett. By Evelyn Abbott and Lewis Campbell. Vol. II, p. 422.

faces the portrait of the same person forty or more years later, if he has survived so long. These documents are extraordinarily optimistic, the comparison of the faces at twenty-two or twenty-three with the faces at sixty-two or sixty-three offering convincing evidence that educated men's experience of life develops both capacity and character to an extraordinary degree."[58]

### 5. The Churches

To the churches, moreover, of the neighborhood, of the state, and of the nation, the president also holds a vital relation. Churches form the most important organized body of public opinion, and of power, in the country. The churches also represent the most serious interest of man, religion. Certain colleges are primarily religious. They were founded, and are nourished, to promote religion in the community, or in the character of the individual.[59] Intellectual

[58] University Administration. By Charles W. Eliot. p. 68.

[59] "At the beginning the president and professors of the college (Amherst) were all preachers. . . . This was the natural result of the fact that the colleges usually had a religious origin, were the offspring of the churches, and were founded with especial reference to the education of ministers. The ministers of those days were upon an average better educated in literature, science and art, than the members of the other learned professions. Their profession was largely a teaching profession. They might well be called an educating guild. Hence, the colleges in looking for a president or professor in the ranks of professional men, would naturally look to ministers. Or if a young

forces and conditions are the primary methods and means for securing this ultimate end. Other colleges are fundamentally intellectual. In them religion is used as a means and method for gaining the primary end of personal culture and power. Yet still other colleges represent the union of these two forces, and in varying proportions. But, to churches of every class and order, the president is to bear the fitting relation. For naturally religious is man, as Tertullian said, and the church, as the exponent of religion, is the most influential force in the community. In order, therefore, to promote the welfare of the community, and to increase the power and to enlarge the constituency of his college, the president is to maintain intimate association with the church.

Of course, if the college is a college of the church, the actual association is of a normal and constituent character. The president in such a case is naturally an ordained minister of that church. With its large affairs and movements, he is, therefore, acquainted and serves in coöperation. Being himself a clergyman, he finds it is less irksome to maintain official relations with all churches, too, than if he were a layman. Certain colleges, moreover, of a somewhat

man were aspiring to a professorship he could scarcely find a better way or place in those days to prepare himself for the work than a tutorship followed by a thorough course of study in a theological seminary. Our colleges were then educational institutions, and did not aspire to be universities."—Autobiography of William Seymour Tyler, D.D., LL.D. p. 74.

undenominational character, have often required their presidents to be clergymen. Woolsey received ordination before he was installed as president of Yale.[60] Certain great college presidents have been great preachers. Such were Walker of Harvard, Mark Hopkins of Williams, McCosh of Princeton, Robinson of Brown, Stearns and Seelye of Amherst, Tucker of Dartmouth, and Hyde of Bowdoin. Their sermons of Sunday continued their work of the other days of the week.

It is still not unknown for ecclesiastical bodies to attack colleges on the ground that they are irreligious or even atheistic in their influences. State universities have, at times, been made the object of such assaults. "Godless" is an epithet not infrequently applied to them. The legislature of a state represents often the attacking force, urged forward by a church, or a small body of the community. The special tool used in the attack is frequently a threat to cut off the annual, or biennial, appropriation. The University of Kentucky has recently thus suffered. Even denominational colleges have not been free from such assaults. For ecclesiastical bodies easily make the charge that the teachings of the classroom, especially of the biological laboratory, are contradictory to the

[60] "Most happily—as all who graduated during his administration will unite in saying—he consented to be ordained, and thus became a preacher whose thoughtful Christian teaching will be remembered by them to the end of their lives."—Memories of Yale Life and Men, 1845-1899. By Timothy Dwight. p. 184.

teachings of the Bible. The president of a college thus suffering is called on to demand freedom for the teacher, and also to require non-interference on the part of an ecclesiastical body, however large or influential, and indeed on the part of the commonwealth itself.

Instances, however, are not lacking in which the president himself becomes the champion of extreme orthodoxy. He may, or he may not, unite with the official bodies of his church, or even with members of the board of trustees, in seeking to carry biological and other scientific teachings into channels of extreme conservatism.[61] But his championship is certain to

[61] The following instance is typical, which is interpolated in a personal letter to me from the professor concerned:

"It is an open secret that the trouble had its origin in the fact that I insisted, in accordance with the terms of my contract with the institution, in considering in my class-work as an integral part of my subject the theory of organic evolution. The agitation against this teaching finally assumed such proportions that our Board of Trustees was compelled to take action to satisfy the agitators. This they did by appointing a committee to investigate, not the teaching in my department, but my personal views on certain purely theological questions which have come into prominence through the Fundamentalist controversy. They were led to take this step by the fact that along with rumors about the character of my teaching there had spread a suspicion among the Baptist constituency of the institution that I was not theologically 'sound,' and the trustees, fearing to dismiss me for my teaching which was in entire harmony with the principle which they had officially approved, decided it would be less to the detriment of the college if they could find some other ground upon which

work great harm. Academic methods of promoting traditional orthodoxy tend to transmute the college from a primarily intellectual instrument and condition into intellectual stagnation, which devitalizes religion and corrupts education. The condition is indeed most unfortunate and the results, interpreted in terms of permanent educational values, disastrous.

The wisest method for the president to use, and the noblest mood for him to nourish, in the adjustment of ecclesiastical difficulties, are well illustrated in the career of White as professor at Michigan, and as the president of Cornell. Of his career in Michigan as professor, he says:

"My greatest desire was to set men and women at thinking, for I felt sure that if they would really think, in the light of human history, they would more and more dwell on what is permanent in Christianity and less and less on what is transient; more and more on its universal truths, less and less upon the creeds,

to base their action. The committee which they appointed met last June and at the request of President ——— ——— I finally submitted to them a statement setting forth my personal views on certain matters. . . . As a result of the report which this committee made early this fall to the Board and which was spread abroad, the agitation against my retention assumed such threatening proportions that the Board felt itself compelled to ask for my resignation on the avowed ground that my 'attitude towards certain basal evangelical beliefs would prevent me from presenting the facts of science in such a way as to strengthen the faith of the students in the doctrines which evangelical Christians hold to be most essential.'"

forms, and observances in which these gems are set; more and more on what draws men together, less and less on that which keeps them apart.

"I became convinced that what the world needed was more religion rather than less; more devotion to humanity and less preaching of dogmas. Whenever I spoke of religion, it was not to say a word against any existing form; but I especially referred, as my ideals of religious conduct, to the declaration of Micah, beginning with the words, 'What doth the Lord require of thee?'; to the Sermon on the Mount; to the definition of 'pure religion and undefiled' given by St. James; and to some of the wonderful utterances of St. Paul. But even this alarmed two or three very good men; they were much exercised over what they called my 'indifferentism'; and when I was chosen, somewhat later, to the presidency of Cornell University, I found that they had thought it their duty to write letters urging various trustees to prevent the election of so dangerous a heretic."[62]

During White's career as president, too, he was guided by basic interpretations which he has well expressed in one of his last autobiographic pages:

"It will, in my opinion, be a sad day for this or for any people when there shall have come in them an atrophy of the religious nature; when they shall have suppressed the need of communication, no matter how vague, with a supreme power in the uni-

[62] Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White. Vol. II. pp. 561-562.

verse; when the ties which bind men of similar modes of thought in the various religious organizations shall be dissolved; when men, instead of meeting their fellow-men in assemblages for public worship which give them a sense of brotherhood, shall lounge at home or in clubs; when men and women, instead of bringing themselves at stated periods into an atmosphere of prayer, praise, and aspiration, to hear the discussion of higher spiritual themes, to be stirred by appeals to their nobler nature in behalf of faith, hope, and charity, and to be moved by a closer realization of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, shall stay at home and give their thoughts to the Sunday papers or to the conduct of their business or to the languid search for some refuge from boredom." [63]

6. (*a*) The High (Preparatory) School;
(b) The Graduate (Professional) School

The college of liberal learning stands between two other educational forces, at once separating and uniting them, the high school or academy, fitting students for college, and the graduate school, receiving the graduates of the college, giving them further education, professional or other. Of course, the president may still have, under his indirect, or even direct, charge, an academy fitting for college, but the anomalous condition is rapidly passing. Of course, he also may be the chief officer of a professional school. Such connection, however, though sig-

[63] Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White. Vol. II. p. 570.

nificant and common, is far from universal. The college as a form of the higher education is more typical than the university. The president, however, may hold a relation to the earlier force and condition, and to the later as well. The earlier relation has several marked characteristics. It represents the beginning and the continuity of the educative process. This process should have its type rather in the uplifting of the prairie levels than in the abruptness of mountain cliffs. In this transition, the president should feel and show intellectual sympathy. He may not seek to guide, or at least to dominate, the conducting or the methods of the preparatory school. But he should know these methods in order to seek to avoid educational waste, to increase educational values, and to promote directness in educational aims and processes. The great Angell of Michigan says:

"The Faculty wisely made provision for a visit to the schools by some University Professors. I made many of these visits. The advantages both to the schools and the University were soon obvious. The methods of the school visited and the fitness of the teachers for their work were made known to the visitors. The opportunity for suggesting improvements was furnished. Interviews with scholars were held. Frequently the visit was made the occasion for a public address on education to the citizens. Conferences were had with the school board. An opinion could be formed concerning the willingness or unwillingness of the town to give the needed support to

the school, for the maintenance of the proper standard of school work. An impulse was given to the public to take a new interest in the school which the University thought worthy of a visit. Above all, an intimate and friendly relation between the school and the town on the one hand and the University on the other was established. The University was also enabled to see what was possible to the High School and was guarded against the danger of asking too much of the students as the condition of admission."[64] This intellectual understanding is made more effective, both as cause and result, through personal sympathy.

To the other end of the educational road, the student of the graduate school, the president bears a relation which is summed up in Matthew Arnold's phrase, the power to "think clear." The graduate, entering the medical, the law, the theological, or other professional school, should be the possessor of a mind fitting him to discover facts, to weigh evidence, to understand relations, to draw inferences. The college president should know and appreciate the demands of the professional school, and should cause his associates of the undergraduate teaching staff to understand, and to meet, such demands. But the relation of the president to the graduate school, professional or philosophical, in a German sense, should be as constructive and organic as to the undergrad-

[64] The Reminiscences of James Burrill Angell. pp. 237-238.

uate college. He should understand the duties which the school of medicine, of law, of theology, of engineering, or other professional training, owes to the community, and also the duties which the community owes to the school. He should recognize the value which each subject of teaching, or of research, may bear to the professional, educational, and other, equipment. He should appreciate the relations of each subject, and of each department, to the others. He should be alert to the changing forces, conditions, and needs, of professional education. He should know and feel the importance of graduate studies in the promotion of learning, ecclesiastical, scientific, literary, or economic, and should recognize the worth of these studies as forming an equipment for the higher teaching.

To these relations, two great presidents of the former generation, Eliot and Gilman, specially gave themselves. Eliot helped indeed to enrich the education which went before the college, and also, and more, to elevate the standards and to enlarge the curriculum, as well as to improve the methods of teaching, in the schools of law and of medicine. By address and by actual service, Gilman, too, aided in making the academy [65] more human, and, above every other president, helped to put all general graduate work, and medical training, in particular, on the highest level.

[65] See address, "De Juventute," published in The Launching of a University. By David Coit Gilman. pp. 297-315.

### 7. Other Presidents

In the general scheme of educational relations, one should not pass over the relation which the individual president holds to other presidents. This relation is large and diverse. England has ten universities, Germany more than twice this number. But the United States is reported, by its national Bureau, as having five hundred eighty-six universities and colleges. Though recognizing that scores of this nearly six hundred possess small claims as worthy institutions of the higher education, yet the number in good repute is enormous. Each of the hundreds of their presidents does hold relations to every other president. In a proper academic community these relations are of noble significance. They fundamentally represent fraternity of spirit, deep professional and lasting personal sympathy. The secondary problems of different colleges and of their officers may be different, but the primary are identical. The primary problems are comprehended in the one problem of the advancement of education. Devotion to the solution of this problem gives to all presidents a keen and broad sense of fellowship and brotherhood. This sense of brotherhood results in coöperation, and coöperation leads, in turn, to an understanding of educational programs and to an adjustment of educational forces. Colleges and their presidents should not, and need not, be unhealthful rivals. Rather they should be thinking of themselves as wholesome rivals in the general endeavor for human betterment. In particular, they each

should seek to do that which each can do best. Schools of forestry, for example, are better fitted to the conditions of the University of Maine, a state three-fourths of whose large area is forest land, than to Brown University, located in a large manufacturing city of a small manufacturing commonwealth. Schools of mining are better fitted to the University of the state of Michigan, or of California, than to the colleges of New Hampshire or of Vermont. Such discriminations and differentiations are normal and natural. Every wise president recognizes them and wishes to adjust his administration to them. Such discriminations and differentiations, I may be allowed to add, are found existing in foreign universities. They obtain in particular in the University of New Zealand and in its constituent colleges.

The relations, however, become personal as well as institutional. Perhaps the personal relations of presidents to each other are summed up in such phrases as helpful fellowship, understanding, sympathy, the spirit of coöperativeness. Causes of jealousy, which may once have existed, have largely passed away. For the educational field has become so enlarged and so deepened that each college is called upon to cultivate a service of specially commanding worth and significance. Unity, and not separateness, is the prevailing mood and motto. Such a mood is manifest in all the primary associations into which presidents are gathered. For the problems of each are the problems of all, and the problems of all the problems of each.

There is one form, however, of the fraternity which will bear further development. It relates to the service which the older members may give to the new. A new president, who feels his responsibilities deeply, —as most do,—needs the sympathy of the veteran. He does not wish to receive advice. If he does wish for it, he will not be reluctant to ask. But he does wish,—though only half conscious of his wish,—sympathy in his endeavors, appreciation of his struggles, and an occasional message of hopefulness, from those who likewise have struggled and who have come forth victorious.

A generation ago, college presidents were more willing to invade each other's professional domains than at present. A nobler spirit of institutional respect and of personal camaraderie prevails. An illustration of methods and conditions, which were formerly far more common, is of the type which G. Stanley Hall of Clark attributed to the great Harper of Chicago. At a time of crisis at Clark University, Harper asked many members of the faculty at Worcester to accept professorships in the University of Chicago. Of this experience, Hall says:

"I finally told him [Harper] that if he would revise his list, releasing a few of our men and taking one or two others whom he had omitted, I would bear the calamity silently and with what grace I could, although I felt his act comparable to that of a housekeeper who would steal in at the back door to engage servants at a higher price. . . . I told him that his

action was like that of the eagle who robbed the fish hawk of his prey.'' [66]

Neither Harper nor Hall is here to give his interpretation of the affair. But this instance, be it added, is not typical of the relations which college executives, or colleges themselves, bear to each other. Neither do I believe it to be typical of Harper himself.

The fraternal relations find a headship,—both as causes, conditions, conclusions,—in many and diverse educational associations. Some of these associations belong to the state and some to the nation. At least one is international. Some are professional, some professorial, and some embrace teachers and scholars of general relationships. The largest and most important of them, and probably the most important in the whole world, is the National Education Association. In the general associations, as well as in the local, it is well for the president to have a membership. For such membership offers an opportunity for both the giving of his wisdom to, and for the receiving of wisdom from, his associates.

In this great fraternity, no one had a bigger heart, a more fraternal affection, a more honest zeal, a quicker wit, or richer humor, than Northrop of Minnesota. A president of a great state university, made greater by his prolonged and enriching service, he had a sympathetic heart for the president of the denominational college of his state, and for the presi-

[66] Life and Confessions of a Psychologist. By G. Stanley Hall, pp. 296-297.

dent of the coördinate university of other states. He maintained and developed a great sense of brotherhood for all presidents throughout the land. Fellowship and coöperation, with a real affection for his brothers, clothed him as with a garment.

It may be fittingly said, also, that one, whom President Murlin, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Boston University, characterized as the first of American educators, has, in his relation to other presidents, made all American college presidents his debtors. For President Eliot has magnified the office. He has helped to make it an example of the most useful and honorable of all vocations. He has minded the business of the office, rejoicing in its opportunities, able to do its duties, grateful for its honors. He has also been candid and frank with all colleges and with the American people. He has, for instance, reproved and rebuked in annual report and public address, the excessive attention paid to athletic sports. He has lacked the tact of Gilman. But his force and prestige have, in a large degree, enabled him to overcome this lack. He has, in the teeth of opposition of many sorts, maintained the proper proportion of the diverse elements which constitute a university. He has kept the intellectual and moral parts supreme. He has quickened the zeal for public service on the part of students and graduates. He has interpreted the financial element of academic administration as a method and means, and never as an end. He has manifested a deep interest in education of all types. He has emphasized, in

writing and in speech, the simple, solid, and enduring parts of the whole educational process. From his point of great advantage, he has, therefore, helped every other president, of whatever order or position, to represent the best type of executive service, to maintain the highest scholarly ideals, and to seek to secure those ideals by orderly methods. To him the words might not unfittingly be applied which Balfour, in the House of Commons, after his death, applied to Gladstone:

"He added a dignity, as he added a weight, to the deliberations of this House by his genius, which I think it is impossible adequately to replace. It is not enough for us to keep up simply a level, though it be a high level, of probity and of patriotism. The mere average of civic virtue is not sufficient to preserve this Assembly from the fate that has overcome so many other Assemblies, products of democratic forces. More than this is required; more than this was given to us by Mr. Gladstone. He brought to our debates a genius which compelled attention, he raised in the public estimation the whole level of our proceedings, and they will be most ready to admit the infinite value of his service who realize how much of public prosperity is involved in the maintenance of the worth of public life, and how perilously difficult most democracies apparently feel it to be to avoid the opposite dangers into which so many of them have fallen." [67]

[67] The Life of William Ewart Gladstone. By John Morley. Vol. III. p. 530.

Happy the president who can live, under a good conscience, a life of fraternal relationship with his colleagues of many and diverse colleges. His career, indeed, is unlike the experiences of Hawkins, the great provost of Oriel for forty-six years (1828-1874):

"The Provost's lot had been cast in a most eventful period of the history of the Church of England,—in *the* most eventful of the fortunes of her two ancient Universities. His days had in consequence been spent amid fierce Academic conflicts; and in these, he had consistently and prominently borne a part second to none in importance and in dignity. A life it had been, from first to last, of obstinate and prolonged antagonism,—of uncompromising resistance, and of stern unbending protest,—against two great successive movements: the 'Tractarian' movement,—which he condemned, as disloyal and dishonest; the 'Liberal' movement,—which he abhorred, as irreligious and revolutionary." [68]

### 8. The Press

To yet another form and force of the community the president bears serious relations. It is the newspaper press. For the welfare of the college can be vastly promoted, or equally vastly hurt, through the newspapers. One of the earlier instances of damage wrought to a college through publicity is found in the history of Vassar College. The period covered the years of administrative uncertainty immediately

[68] Lives of Twelve Good Men. By John William Burgon. Vol. I. p. 455.

preceding the presidency of the beloved Taylor. For, every paper from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon, was inclined to attribute to the first of the great colleges for women, every current story of the silly behavior of students, or every humorous allusion to the "blue-stocking" nonsense of the woman graduate. Such a popular association or connotation was working grave harm to the college. The condition, however, came to an end, at the accession of Taylor, through his dealing, directly, wisely, considerately, with the editors of the New York journals.

Of course, such dealing could not fail to bring forth the desired result. The silliness of the college graduate as a subject of editorial comment, and especially as it concerned the graduate of Vassar, presently ceased. The service thus done through Taylor was a rich one for all colleges. A like method was followed by McCosh in his dealing with the public reports of Princeton's disturbances.[69]

[69] "When these *émeutes* took place we were always favored with the visits of interviewers from the New York newspapers. I remember that one day when I was coming down from New York, I had a dozen reporters on the same train, all bent on carrying back a sensational story founded on some small disturbance which had occurred the night before. At one of these times a reporter from a reputable journal called on me for information. I told him that I would give him this, but that he must publish what I said to him, which he agreed to do, and so I began: 'Whereas a certain newspaper,' naming it, 'has been publishing vile stories against Princeton College, evidently written by sub-editors from a rival college, the alumni and students of Princeton are about to form a combination in

The president does desire, and should desire, to promote proper public notice of the college, of its works, of its workers, of its plans, and of its means for carrying out these plans. He cannot sympathize with the judgment of those of his colleagues who hold that the less said about the college in the newspaper, the better it is for the college. For, to the community the college is constantly appealing for the opportunity of educating its sons and its daughters, and the community, through its homes, is as constantly appealing to the college to give this education. It is also, with equal constancy, appealing to the community to bestow its wealth for endowment and for buildings. Knowledge is the basis which the community has the

which each member binds himself never to buy a copy of that paper.' The reporter wrote a while, and then put his pen behind his ear, and said, 'President, this will never do,' and promised to speak to the editor; and in a day or two after the editor wrote me, asking me to appoint a reporter from among the students, and we were troubled no more from that quarter.

"I mention these things in order to give me an opportunity of explaining that these scenes of disturbance, which were reported years ago in so exaggerated a form, almost always rose from our putting down debasing customs. I could not in dignity answer the distorted reports, and many believed them. We have now, happily, put down all these old barbarous customs, and of late years I have no complaint to make of the newspaper press. It seems inclined to speak good of us rather than evil; as to myself, I am sure it praises, vastly more than they deserve, the efforts I have made for the advancement of the college."—The Life of James McCosh. Edited by William Milligan Sloane. pp. 219-220.

right to demand that it shall have as the support of such appeals. Publicity is not to be regarded as an end, but as a means, in this procedure. Mr. John St. Loe Strachey, of the London *Spectator,* in his autobiography, however, says: "Publicity is an end as well as a means. There are positive and distinct virtues inherent in publicity quite apart from the fact that it is the medium through which the journalist works. This fact is beginning to be realized more and more in this country. In America, it has long been recognized. There, indeed, publicity may be said to have been crowned. It is considered one of the pillars of society, and so in truth it is."[70] The publicity should be conducted in veracity, in proportion, in good taste. It must, of course, be absolutely free from falseness, from triviality, and from vulgarity. The truth is to be told truthfully and persuasively. It is a fact, as that eminent and tried journalist, Talcott Williams, says: "No man can permit . . . conditions to lead into a departure from the truth, the use of an unsound argument, the advocacy of a policy which he believes harmful to the state, or the acquiescence in known evil or secret wrong."[71]

The peril is, however, that college news is not told in the papers with a sense of relative values, and, therefore, is presented with essential untruthfulness. Of course, the editor may believe that his readers

[70] The Adventure of Living. By John St. Loe Strachey. p. 313.

[71] The Newspaper Man. By Talcott Williams. p. 49.

regard the report of last Saturday's football game, between Princeton and Yale, as more important than the discoveries, made last week, in the Sterling Laboratory at New Haven. Let us assume that he has some reason for his belief. Acting on this belief, he gives far more space to the ephemeral game than to the lasting discoveries. Nevertheless, the president is to seek to convince the editor that the chemical discoveries will have meaning for the world when the name of every member of both "Elevens" shall be starred in the quinquennial catalogue.[72] He is ever

[72] The relative value, in the opinion of editors, of educational and of prize fighting news is brought into sharp contrast in the reports found of the meetings of the National Education Association and of the World Conference on Education, and a prize fight at Shelby, Montana, on the fourth of July, 1923. Eight New York papers gave relatively fourteen inches of space to the prize fight and one to the Education Conference. The Chicago papers practically ignored the Education Conference, as did four morning papers of Philadelphia. In the Washington papers, the relationship was fifty to one. The proportions in the Boston papers, also, were:

| | Prize fight inches | Educational conference inches |
|---|---|---|
| Post | 398½ | 0 |
| Globe | 228 | 0 |
| Transcript | 25½ | 40 |
| Herald | 316 | 0 |
| Christian Science Monitor | 0 | 227 |
| | 968 | 267 |

—School and Society. Vol. XVIII, No. 446. July 14, 1923. pp. 43-44.

to seek to give the serious facts and fundamental truths, concerning the college, to the people. For, these facts and truths should be known. The people have the right to know them. It is one of the highest duties of democracy to know them. The college is benefited by the people knowing them. Such publicity is a method for the proper appreciation, by the people, of the higher education.

Among the more outstanding presidents who believed in the doctrine and practice of publicity was Pepper of Pennsylvania. Of him, his biographer, Thorpe, says:

"He was a believer in advertising; he knew its immense value. His relations with newspaper men were cordial and, with a few, intimate. Through them he felt the public pulse. His policy was twofold: to keep matters out of the newspapers as well as to put matters in. The first is often of greater importance. University news was more or less carefully edited before it was suffered to appear in print. The censorship was complete and fruitful." [73]

### 9. The General Community

Besides these relations, more or less specific, the president holds relations to the whole community as a social unit. The relations may be summed up in a few comprehensive words. One of these words is leadership. His educational leadership of the com-

[73] The Life of William Pepper, M.D., LL.D. By Francis Newton Thorpe. p. 467.

munity is as fitting as it is necessary for his board of trustees. He is to embody a leadership which gives information without prejudice, light without undue heat, sympathy without sentimentalism, and a sense of commandingness without arrogance. Such leadership he may give by his speaking and writing, as did Anderson of Rochester in the earlier time. For Anderson, as the first president of the University of Rochester and serving it for thirty-five years, embodied a specially wise method and virile force in public quickening and guidance. In the period of the Civil War, his rich and vigorous personality, manifest in voice and pen, was said to be worth a corps of soldiers in the field. Such leadership is to be free from political and other partisanships. The president also is to recognize the worth of, and to demand as a right, freedom of speech. His fellow officers in the community are willing to give him full freedom of speech. His fellow officers and the community are willing to give him full freedom for use and not for abuse. He is not, however, to suffer his office to be made a bugle for summoning the clans of a narrow political party, or a bulletin board for denominational creeds. His conduct and his allegiance are to be given to equality of rights and of privileges, and in behalf of a large and human brotherhood.

In the relation between the community and the president, the point of view of the community is of primary value. The community indeed feels it has the right to require much of the president. Its re-

quirements become almost demands. These demands are miscellaneous, and often are made in rather an imperative mood. Be it said, however, that the community has not the *right* to make demands on the president outside of the field of education. It has not the *right* to ask his judgment, or teaching, or direction, respecting political matters. He is not a statesman. It has not the *right* to require of the president, judgment, teaching, and direction, respecting theological matters, such as "fundamentalist" or "modern" controversies. He is not a theological or ecclesiastical historian. Neither has it the *right* to ask him to be a public orator,—a public orator dealing with general public questions apart from their educational relations. Likewise, it has not the *right* to regard him as the toastmaster of social, or semi-social, affairs, a Samson making sport for the multitude. If the public has no *rights* of this type, neither is he to feel the sense of duty to respond to such invitations. But the public has the right, and he is correspondingly bound by the coördinate duty, to give light upon all educational questions and to offer leading in all educational undertakings. Especially is the field of education his province on occasions of the interpretation of education, and these occasions are numerous and commanding in American society. There are presidents, however, who seem to wish, or at least to be willing, to be regarded as having knowledge beyond the educational domain. Of such willingness the public has the right to avail

itself; but, be it added, and firmly, that the president who thus ventures outside of his field of education, both broad and narrow, usually, if he gain much, loses more. In education he is an expert. Outside of education, he is not.

Service, however, for all the people, is an element in his popular relationship. His motto is to serve, as his desire is to be free. In his interpretation of freedom, and in his judgment touching service, he is to be guided by noble wisdom, by absolute sincerity, and by a sense of high idealism. He should nourish his personal power and development in order to promote his social usefulness. To him, possessing such a mood and guided by such principles, the public is to give its confidence, and he, in turn, is to give the public all that lieth in himself.

In this relation, of the president to the people, are found two functions which are of primary value,—the ability to speak and to write with acceptableness. For, the people have, or at least feel that they have, the right to know what a president thinks about education and about subjects allied to education. They also wish to know him as a person. Either speaking or writing bears to them a certain degree of such knowledge. The president is to accept opportunities for speaking and for writing on educational themes, with grateful eagerness. For it is of serious importance that the people should know and appreciate the conditions, the aims, the methods, the difficulties, the worth, of the higher education. In a new coun-

try, and in an age, materialistic and self-assertive, the people are liable to become indifferent to the still small voice, and blind to the far-off vision. In their hearts, they know and feel that education and moral welfare are the foundations of the commonwealth. A majority of them are willing to follow intelligent and sympathetic leadership. They wish only to be assured that the leadership is intelligent, that all expenditures, administrative, personal, pecuniary, are economically efficient, and that proper results are reasonably certain. The president is to inspire, to give intellectual enlargement and enrichment, to point out the relationships of different grades of education, to bear knowledge to legislative committees and to legislators, to chambers of commerce and to the many and diverse associations and clubs into which American society organizes itself. The addresses of Gilman and White embody educational knowledge and guidance, in quickening forcefulness. The papers and the speeches of Draper, of Taylor, of Lowell, of Butler, of Alderman, of Schurman, of Burton of Michigan,[74] and of Finley,—president and editor—are high examples of the kind of service which all presidents may rightfully be asked to give. Interpretations of this character may at times turn academic disaster into academic triumph. They also aid in the proper progress of ordinary business. This power, used before a body of trustees or before a

[74] Burton's death is among the greatest of all our college calamities.

faculty, is a rich asset. But eloquent speech, made to a large audience, is quite a different matter. For eloquent speech springs from and goes to the emotions. It hardly belongs to the disentangling of academic complexities. No more does it belong to the elucidation of scholastic or executive progress to thoughtful men. Such speech may belong, however, to the adoption of a program, though even at such a juncture its exercise is accompanied with perils. Harper of Chicago did not lose by lacking the power of thrilling emotion. In fact I am inclined to believe he gained by not having it. Neither did Gunsaulus, the president of Armour Institute, gain in scholarly esteem by his abounding fullness in such utterance.[75]

In writing, the field is less well cultivated than in public speech. But the whole body of the people, as well as the academic fraternity, has found quickening in the books and papers of Woodrow Wilson while president of Princeton, of Hyde of Bowdoin, of Hall of Clark, of Lowell of Harvard, of Butler of Columbia, of Finley of three historic presidencies, of King of Oberlin; and, if one may go abroad, in the writings of Michael Sadler, formerly of the University of Leeds and now of University College, Oxford, of

[75] One does not forget, however, that a few weeks before accepting the presidency of Union College, in 1804, Dr. Eliphalet Nott gave a noble memorial oration on Alexander Hamilton. The formal address, which President Alderman, of the University of Virginia, gave on President Wilson, in December, 1924, before Congress and other bodies at Washington, is among the best of biographical orations.

Warren also of Oxford, of Benson of Cambridge, and of George Adam Smith of Aberdeen.

The relations of the president to the community take on special meaning in the case of the state university. For the university of a state is supported largely from the revenues derived from the people of the state. Either through the appropriations made under the general law, or through special grants, the revenue of the university is drawn largely from public taxes. The amount thus given, in the case of the greater universities, such as California, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, rises in some instances into seven millions or more, of the ordinary year. This vast sum is given, and given gladly, by the whole body of the people. The president represents the institution which is thus made a grateful beneficiary. The president also represents a worthy purpose and method for the continuance, and even for the deserved enlargement of appropriations. Through every fitting opportunity he is to show forth gratitude, and also to make plain that larger beneficences would result in a yet nobler enriching of the enduring resources of the commonwealth.

Of this condition, Van Hise of Wisconsin has given an interpretation:

"It has been said that the university should be the soul of the nation; that is not my phrase, but I shall be proud of the university just in proportion as it becomes the soul of the state. Every man of high ideals is a part of that soul. Every institution

which works for the upbuilding of humanity, be it church or prison, is a part of the soul of the state. Every school and college is a part of that soul; and it should be the aim of each to be as large a part as possible. The university, the culmination of the educational system of the state, would be a miserable institution indeed if it could not justly claim to be a large segment of the soul of the state. The university should not be a follower but a leader and in all fields."[76]

President Hutchins of Michigan also has said:

"The office of the president of the state university should be the center of university organization and activity that has in view the bringing of the institution into closer touch with the people. Movements of this kind have, during recent years, as we all know, been numerous and varied. Within proper limits they should be encouraged. The people who support the universities, are demanding direct university service. Their attitude is a reasonable one, and the demand should be met whenever it is general and the service asked is of university grade and can be more economically and efficiently rendered by the university than by any other state instrumentality. The development of work along this line ordinarily calls for the organization and carrying on of a separate and distinct department. Though in form independent, this department should be in close touch

[76] The Place of the University in a Democracy. By Charles R. Van Hise. School and Society, Vol. IV, July 15, 1916, No. 81. p. 85.

with, and receive general directions from, the presidential office. The president is ordinarily in close touch with the people of the state. He should know what the people need in the way of direct service and the extent to which the university is able to, and should, meet the demand. Moreover, he is in a position to ascertain whether the demand is a real and general one or whether it arises from the mistaken enthusiasm of a few. He better than any other university official can so regulate the scheme of service and its extent that the greatest amount of good will come of it both to the university and to the people of the state." [77]

In the state university, and especially in a university of personal trustees, an important, but vague, question frequently arises. The president of institutions of either type is constantly asked to give to the public and to many individuals services which are not academic, services which, on the whole, belong to a small section of the community and relate to narrow problems. He is asked to offer light and leading to causes communal, frequently personal. Commercial bodies, social clubs, literary societies represent the normal type. What should be his mood toward such demands? On the one hand, it may be said, as I have

[77] The President's Office, Center of University Organization and Activity. Address by Harry Burns Hutchins. Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities in the United States of America. Vol. XII, 1914. pp. 126-127.

already intimated, that no one of these causes need command his interest and no one of these persons has a *right* to make such demands. He consequently is under no obligation either to serve the cause or to meet the demands. On the other hand, it may be justly argued that the university and college of either the public or private type is an institution of the community. The community constantly grants to the university great favors. For instance, it frees the university from most taxes. The university is constantly, directly or indirectly, approaching the community for grants of money. The worth of the university to the community is dependent, in no small degree, upon the favor with which the community regards it. Therefore, it may be justly argued, the president is under obligation, either general or specific, to serve the community in all possible ways. In order to enhance the worth of the university to the community, he should give to the community all services, and of every sort, lying in his power. In even a selfish interpretation, he should be able and eager to serve. The more he, as president, gives, the more his university receives. A niggardly policy in respect to the use of his strength in his availing himself of opportunities cannot but tend toward a resulting similarly niggardly policy on the part of the community toward the university.

It is, therefore, evident that the president should regard his powers as a trust held for the whole community and for each individual member thereof. In

making and applying such an interpretation, however, he is constantly obliged to measure the worth of opportunities and the varying degrees of the obligation which the conditions create. To most presidents, opportunities and duties are open far in excess of their powers of embracing the one or of doing the other. Abounding wisdom is necessary for making discreet decisions.

It is easy to misinterpret and to misapply the proper relation of the president to the public. Sometimes he seeks to be a general business executive. As such, he enters into all the civic affairs of the little or of the large community, often seeking to dominate, not simply to guide, or to oversee these affairs. So constant, so forceful, and so efficient may be his service, that his interest in non-academic business interferes with his interest and service in affairs academic. His general executive dissipation lessens his proper efficiency.

In these several and diverse relations which the president holds, he may frequently ask himself whether he is following the statutes or the by-laws which are usually laid down for the guidance of himself and of his colleagues. If there be such a code, of course its precepts he is to obey. Even without knowing them, he would probably find that he unconsciously heeds them. It is well, and in most cases necessary, for a university to have by-laws. Although, even without such prescriptions, many colleges find that the conduct of their affairs is har-

monious and efficient. The precedent, in academic, as well as in English, government, constitutes and declares essential methods. But formal codes should do no harm, and, in times of crisis, which are sure to arise, they may give light, or even deliverance. For the advantages and disadvantages of written, or unwritten, constitutions in political governments apply to academic affairs. But in affairs, academic or other, codes of laws should be so formed, interpreted, and applied, as to promote the great purposes, through wise methods, under freest conditions, of the higher education. For, the president is in fact, in many respects, an English prime minister. Certain rights, duties, responsibilities can hardly come into the field of definition. The university constitution may be written or unwritten. But *his* constitution cannot be written. He is a watchman on the academic wall, a proposer of academic policies, a leader in academic debates, and a uniting and quickening force in academic movements. He is indeed the philosopher-king of Plato's "Republic." If, in the good performance of specific duties, this Platonic king possesses a great soul, a great soul devoted to the common life, his place becomes one of inexpressible strength, of beauty, and of worth. He may ultimately come to be to his community, be that community either local or general, for instance, what Phillips Brooks was to Boston, and to Massachusetts, and to New England, a quickening influence, a human force, moving unto the best. Such presidents may be, for our present purpose, nameless.

For their names, even be they few, are on the lips of the reader.

A question of primary importance in respect to these diverse relationships is often asked: What is the best age for the president to take office? Of course, a president of any age may be justified. The man, not the age, is the chief or only consideration. (Delane became the editor of *The Times* at twenty-three.) The following are among the more significant examples: Nott became president of Union at thirty-one years; McCosh of Princeton at fifty-seven; Patton of Princeton at forty-five; Eliot of Harvard at thirty-five; Angell of Michigan at forty-two; Barnard of Columbia at fifty-five; Harper of Chicago at thirty-five; Woods of Bowdoin at thirty-two; Northrop of Minnesota at fifty; Bascom of Wisconsin at forty-seven; Fairchild of Oberlin at forty-nine; Stearns of Amherst at forty-nine, and Seelye of Amherst at fifty-two; Smith of Dartmouth at fifty-nine; Draper of Illinois at forty-six. Burton of Minnesota and Michigan took his first college presidency at Smith at the age of thirty-six. Hyde of Bowdoin became president at twenty-six, as did also Mrs. Alice Freeman Palmer of Wellesley, at the same age.[78]

[78] The early age at which many American statesmen came into public life is significant and impressive. Jefferson was thirty-three when he wrote the Declaration of Independence. John Marshall was not thirty-three when he spoke, in 1788, in the Virginia Convention for the ratification of the Constitution. Madison, Monroe, Hamilton, were still young men when they were arguing for rati-

President Hyde has, with both wisdom and wit, interpreted the advantage of an early age of beginning:

"Not because I myself happened to begin the work of a college president at the age of twenty-six (though I do believe it is a good plan to catch material for that office while it is still green and pliable), but because in an experience of twenty-four years I have seen ninety-five per cent of all administrative reforms advocated and accomplished by men under thirty-five, I heartily endorse President Eliot's principle of juniority as the distinguishing mark of a progressive as distinct from a stagnant institution. I could point to a period of twenty years in the history of Bowdoin College when it was exclusively in the control of old men. During that period hardly a dollar was added to its funds; not a county was added to its constituency; not a new subject was introduced; not a method was changed; not a single improvement made. The spirit of that whole period was summed up in the answer of the most conservative of that group of aged professors to a student who asked to be referred to some more recent work upon anatomy than the antiquated textbook employed, 'No bones have been added to the human body since that book was written.' There are plenty of young fellows in all our faculties who would make splendidly successful college presidents. But when trustees insist upon

fication. The Revolution and its following crises were carried forward by leaders in their mature youth.

making the figurehead qualities appropriate to a man of fifty an essential requirement, naturally it takes them a long while to find their man. Men who start young in a calling sometimes never grow old. But a man who starts old never grows young."[79]

The principle, determining the age, has at least two sides. It is well for one to be old enough to have maturity, and young enough to allow a long term. For long terms, though not too long, are the more fruitful. The president is to be old enough to be a leader and inspirer of men even older, and, he would add, wiser than himself, and young enough to have sympathy with youth and to give ground of hopefulness to others, and to himself as well, in his own improvement. Mature youthfulness and youthful maturity are needed in an office beset with the possibilities of fundamental mistakes in either judgment or act.

But there is also need in the president, whatever his age in point of time, of a quality which, for the lack of an exact term, I shall call simple, pure youthfulness. This quality is as far off from the boyish as it is from the aged, as remote from the puerile as it is from the senile. It stands for vigor, resilience, swift recuperation from weariness, enthusiasm, hopefulness, a sense of triumph. Of Leigh, provost of King's, Cambridge, and for a time vice-chancellor of

[79] Personality and College Professors. By William DeWitt Hyde. The Outlook, August 21, 1909. Vol. 92, pp. 933-934.

the university, it is said: "He retained to the end a buoyancy of spirit and a perpetual spring of youthfulness which corresponded to their own, and fitted him admirably for acting as their comrade." [80] The president should not be made of iron. For iron breaks if struck too hard, and he is not wholly free from blows. He should be made rather of steel. For steel bends, and only when stretched too far does it snap,—and, be it added, when it is stretched too far, it does snap. Youth is the victim of anxieties, but bears them with greater ease than does age. When the president finds the executive load becoming heavy, he should at once seek to lay it down. If he does not, it will, before long, lay him in his grave, or, what is worse, lay him upon his bed. If, without himself knowing that the load has become a burden, his wise friends give him warning testimony that the duty has become too heavy, he also should ask for relief. The more anxious look, the paler color, and deepening furrows, unnoticed by himself, but recognized by others, prove that his successive successes are being paid for in weakening tissue and thinning blood. Some presidents keep youth in age. Most presidents age while still in youth.

The preceding sections of this chapter intimate the number and diversity of the relationships which the American college president holds. They show, at once, his rights and duties, his authorities and

[80] Augustus Austen Leigh. Edited by William Austen Leigh, fellow of King's College, Cambridge. p. 287.

limitations, his forces, personal and official, his methods, the greatness of the office, and its possibilities of lasting and deep influence. It is indeed an office unique in educational history.

The more obvious comparisons are found in the vice-chancellorship of Oxford, and the rectorship of a German university. But these comparisons are rather contrasts than similarities. At Oxford, the contrast, belonging to the whole system of academic atmosphere and government, is impressively manifest in the few duties assigned to the vice-chancellor. His term is brief, not exceeding four years, and his chief authority relates largely to examinations and to conferring degrees. An American graduate, who yet was a son of Oxford, says of the work of the vice-chancellor: "He has to punish wrong-doers, and to inquire into evil courses. With the Proctors and lesser university officers he exercises a general oversight of all University havings. With the Proctors he has the guardianship of the liberties of the University, of all records and registers, and of the concerns of University discipline as well as of the Court of the University, styled the Vice-Chancellor's Court." [81]

To the heads of the colleges, moreover, belong many duties which are usually performed by the American president. These duties are manifold. Not long before his death, Dr. A. L. Smith, the master of Balliol, wrote me of his work. It virtually concerned all college affairs. It would be hard to name any single

[81] Oxford as It Is. By Louis Dyer. p. 13.

duty which he did not do, or any opportunity into which he did not enter. Arthur C. Benson, the master of Magdalene at Cambridge, gave me, a year before his death, an interesting interpretation of his work as the head of the college:

"At most colleges the head is called master, at one college (King's) he is provost, and at one college (Queen's) he is president.

"What makes it a little more confusing is that at several colleges—this, for instance—the second in command is called president, because he presides over the college hospitality.

"In a general way the duties of the head of the house are to reside during the term, to preside at college meetings, to transact certain college business and to exert a general supervision over the whole place. This does not seem to be very exacting, but as a matter of fact all matters of any importance are referred to him. I have almost daily interviews with the proctor about candidates for admission and questions of discipline, and the progress (or the reverse) of students. Then I often have interviews with the bursar about financial matters, with the dean or chaplain about the chapel service, with the librarian about the library.

"I do a certain amount of teaching (but I do not think any other master does)—two or three men bring me essays almost every day which I read and criticize.

"Some masters do part of the tutorial work; some

do part of the bursarial work; then most masters have a certain amount of university work (I am for instance on the library syndicate)—and take the vice-chancellorship in rotation.

"Moreover I send for two or three students every day and have a short talk with them about their work and interests and intentions." [82]

The service of the rector of a German university is, compared to a Cambridge mastership or to the Oxford vice-chancellorship, very simple. Like the Oxford office, the German is temporary. A great interpreter of German university education and life says:

"Although the authority of the elected heads of the universities is a modest one, and the office in general, when compared with the position of a president of an American university, is rather of an ornamental character, it is nevertheless not entirely without significance. Imagine at the head of the university an official appointed by the government, like the *recteur de l'académie* in France, a man, let us say, in the position of a provincial school director, and the difference becomes at once apparent. The German rector is the visible symbol of the corporative independence of the university." [83]

Weighed in the comparative scales of English and German university administration, the chief officer

[82] From a personal letter.

[83] The German Universities and University Study. By Friedrich Paulsen. p. 78.

of the American university is distinguished by authority, efficiency, initiative, and usually scholarly abilities, having democratic affiliations and an intimate association with all the forces that constitute society and the state. To discuss which of these forms and methods is the best would be vain. Probably each is the best for its own national type and service. For each is, in a sense, an indigenous growth. It might, however, be fair to add that both the English and the German system would possibly be benefited by an adoption, in a certain degree, of the efficiency of the American, and, as surely, the American would be likewise benefited by an added emphasis on the value of high scholarship which the vice-chancellorship and rectorship normally represent and embody.

## CHAPTER III

### AS AN OFFICER AND AS A PERSONALITY

The relations, therefore, which the president holds to these several bodies and to the diverse forms and conditions of the community, are fundamental and important. Yet the elements which go together to make him what he is, as an officer and as a man, and even the simple qualities characteristic of him, are still more significant and revealing.

### 1. Health

The more obvious of these elements and qualities is physical health. Great as is the worth of physical health in every worker, its worth to the president is peculiarly great,—and for three reasons. The first reason lies in the fact that his life is spent and his work is done with young people. To young people, the health of a superior officer has an especially inspiring influence, or, negatively, physical infirmity has over them a strong, doleful, depressing influence. Respect for an officer, constitutionally weak, is hard to maintain among adolescent youths who are themselves incarnations of physical sturdiness and vigor. Porter of Yale never received the respect which his character and ability warranted, by reason of giving

the impression of lacking virility. Leigh of King's, to whom I have just referred, played games till his seventh decade. One cause, and in part an unconscious one, of the great popularity of the college athlete is found in his simple physical strength and health.

A second reason for the value of health to the president lies in the fact that the business of college administration makes heavy demands on the general strength of the president, and especially on his nervous system. He, therefore, should be eager to carry, and should carry, a surplus. Bascom, that able scholar and quickening teacher, as well as devoted president, admired and loved, lacked this surplus. He himself says:

"A good deal of the overflow of life arises from the redundancy of vitality. This physical impulse has almost always been wanting in me. The words have died on the lips because of the physical languor back of them." [84]

The third reason of the worth of physical vigor to the president lies in the closeness of the connection between health and happiness. Health leads to happiness, as happiness to health. The intimacy of the relationship, existing between the president and the several bodies affiliated with his college, makes it especially necessary that he be free from irritability. Such a mood increases the difficulty of his doing business, or of doing business with him, and of carry-

[84] Things Learned by Living. By John Bascom. p. 135.

ing forward administration. In not a few instances, it is easy to trace the connection between physical disability and executive inefficiency. Mark Pattison, in early life, suffered from a disease of the eyes (like the elder Dwight of Yale), and at times also throughout his life. His weakness may have contributed to his well-known peculiarities of personality and of administration. In general, the great presidents have been embodiments of superb health. Of Pepper, it is said:

"His habit of working all day and every day as hard as was in him may be illustrated by outlining an average day of his life. He arose at a quarter of seven, took a cold sponge bath, and was in his office at 7.15, from which time he dictated letters and opinions for an hour, breakfasting while seeing patients, which together with all sorts of business occupied him till 11.30. His medical lectures, twice a week, occurred at twelve or one, as the roster committee might arrange. Till half-past two he was in consultation, and usually in his office from half-past two until four. His luncheon, always a light one, was taken in his office. He was in consultation till 7.15, excepting the time—usually 5.30 to 6.30, four times a week—given to lectures. He dined often with company at home or elsewhere. He was again in consultation from 8.30 until 10, from which later hour he dictated to one of his stenographers until past midnight, frequently till 2.30. This division of time, with minor variations, was maintained habitually.

He insisted that such labor was only possible by moderate, slow eating, thorough chewing, and short naps of five minutes at any time or place.'' [85]

''In August, 1893, he speaks of himself as being 'perfectly well, brown, and strong,' and as 'going off on a row of many miles in the evening.' But he never cared for systematic exercise, depending rather for health upon abstemiousness, moderation, and care. He conserved his physical energies rather than exercised them.'' [86]

Of the great Whewell of Cambridge, it is said: ''His health was always excellent . . . It was his habit to sit up late; but, notwithstanding, he appeared regularly at morning chapel, then at 7 a. m., fresh and radiant, and ready for the day's work. This vigor of body enabled him to appreciate everything with a keenness which age could not dull, nor the most poignant grief extinguish, except for very brief intervals. He thoroughly appreciated 'the mere joy of living'; and whatever was going forward attracted him so powerfully that he was never satisfied until he had found out all about it. He went everywhere: to public ceremonials and exhibitions; to new plays, new music, new pictures; to London drawing-rooms and smart country houses; to quiet parsonages and canonical residences; to foreign cities and English cathedrals; always deriving the keenest enjoyment

[85] The Life of William Pepper, M.D., LL.D. By Francis Newton Thorpe. p. 457.

[86] *Ibid.*, pp. 466-467.

from what he saw, and delighting in new experiences because they were new."[87]

The value of physical health in the administrator is seen and felt in the later presidents of Harvard College. But its value is no less marked possibly in the life of an early president. Of President Chauncy it is said, he "preserved his vigor of mind and his strenuousness of purpose unimpaired to the last. The attempt was made, one winter's day, to dissuade him from fulfilling an engagement to preach, and it was said to him, 'Sir, you will certainly die in the pulpit;' whereupon, as if determined not to perish midway in a snowdrift, he plunged through the drift with almost juvenile alertness and energy, replying, 'How happy should I be, if what you say might prove true!' When urged to remit his excessive labor, and to seek such relief as a veteran worker could fairly claim, he was wont to answer, *Oportet imperatorem stantem mori*,—'A commander ought to die on his feet.' This was almost the case with him."[88]

Of course there are presidents who have proved good officers under the handicap of physical weakness and infirmity. But the need of firm health of the president becomes greater according to the increase in variety and to the urgency of the duties laid upon him. It is seldom that a candidate should be called to

[87] Old Friends at Cambridge and Elsewhere. By J. Willis Clark. pp. 9-10.

[88] Harvard Graduates Whom I Have Known. By Andrew Preston Peabody. pp. 248-249.

the office, or should accept, who is not gifted with enduring health.

The value of health to the president is quite as great as it can possibly be to the author. Mr. Ruskin, writing to Charles Eliot Norton, in the year 1876, says: "But even through all this I can fight yet, if I can only carry on with rhubarb pills instead of a stomach. Grief kills me, not by its own strength, but by indigestion."[89] The college president needs to be free from such vagaries as arose from the ill health of John Ruskin or of Thomas Carlyle.

As a part of the process of and for health, the president is to be a good loafer. That condition, which has been said to be one of the happy results of Oxford training, is normally to belong to him. He is to embody the trinity of virtues, and of graces, of sleep, food, exercise. He is not to worry. He is properly to unite vocation and avocations unto blessed recreations. He may have nerves, but he is not to be nervous. He may have a conscience, but he is not to be overconscientious. He is to be a playboy in order to be a workman.

## 2. Scholarship

The president is called usually an administrator or executive. The two words, even with their difference in meaning, are applied, as I have already intimated, with equal fitness to the office. For, administration

[89] Letters of John Ruskin to Charles Eliot Norton. Vol. II, p. 113.

ends in executive act, and executive act looks back to administrative principle and method. In such an office, through recent changes, the intellectual part has become subordinated. And yet the intellectual part, of course, still remains of primary worth.

The president of the earlier time was, as I have before said, a scholar.[90] He was a teacher, as well as an executive. The president of the immediate past was frequently a scholar and a teacher,—Harper of Hebrew, Hyde of philosophy, Pepper of medicine, Woodrow Wilson of politics, and the elder Angell of international law (which he, as an ambassador, also practiced) are outstanding illustrations. Of course, Jowett of Balliol, throughout his long and illustrious career, interpreted Greek by both voice and pen, as also did his contemporary, the unique, and less known, Mark Pattison of Lincoln. But with the increase in number, variety, and importance of executive duties, the tendency to choose men of executive worth has also increased. If, moreover, a scholar be elected as president, the peril is that he will find his scholarly worths are depreciated, and his scholarly relations limited, by executive duties. President Patton of Princeton once said to me that the new president thinks—as did he himself—that he can do both tasks. He soon learns his mistake.

[90] Abiel Holmes' Life of President Stiles contains interpretations of three Yale presidents who were scholars, Williams (p. 390), and especially Clap (p. 393), and of Stiles himself (p. 353).

But whether the president be a scholar or not, he is at least to be sympathetic with the scholars of the faculty over which he presides, and constantly eager should he be to promote the great causes which they as constantly represent and vitally serve. For, the scholar is either the end or the means, or the method, of securing the purpose of the college. But, at all events, the president is to recognize that he is only the necessary force or method for nourishing high scholarly interests. He really is, in the academic order, a means. His success will be measured, according to the higher standards, by his interpretation of himself as a subordinate in the academic routine. Of the great Quincy of Harvard, it is said: "Having no charge whatever of teaching connected with his functions, he kept himself advised of the manner in which each professor and tutor did his work, and frequently made visits of inspection and examination, so that his superintending eye should be ever felt by all parties to be upon them. In the arrangement and direction of studies he took an intelligent and active share, endeavoring to make the labors of the teachers as easy and agreeable as was consistent with their duty to the taught."[91]

### 3. Judicialness

Closely associated with the scholarship, or the lack of scholarship, of the president is the possession of

[91] Life of Josiah Quincy. By his son, Edmund Quincy. p. 483.

the judicial quality of mind. He is called to be a judge and not an attorney. Evidence upon points of academic procedure, complex, important, or trivial, he is constantly obliged to analyze and to evaluate. This judicial quality was specially eminent in Angell of Michigan. In some critical cases, so just and fair was his mind, that he seemed guilty of unnecessary indecision. Neutrality is indeed a peril to be avoided. Angell desired to eliminate, and did succeed in eliminating, above most presidents, academic disorderliness and disorders; but sometimes at the price of giving the impression of the lack of fearless judgment. President Walker of Harvard was by some believed to be of a like type. Of him, Dr. A. P. Peabody says:

"I ought not to omit mention of what seemed his intended and studied neutrality . . . on such subjects in religion, ethics, philosophy, politics, and practical life as divide the opinion of honest, right-minded, well-disposed Christian men. He was far enough from being double-tongued. He could not be equally claimed on either side, but he seemed to be on neither side, of mooted questions of all kinds. A friend of mine, learning that he was going to preach at King's Chapel, on a Thanksgiving Day, on Popular Amusements, went to hear him, with a special desire to know what he thought of the theatre, which in Boston was then just coming from evil into fair repute. His report was that he heard from Dr. Walker more in favor of the theatre than he had

ever imagined, and more against it than he had ever known, but that it was impossible to ascertain from the sermon whether the speaker approved or condemned theatre-going. This anecdote represents the attitude which he maintained as to disputed measures of social reform, as to political questions that from time to time occupied the public mind, as to matters of religious discussion in which it seemed hardly possible that he should not bear a part, and equally, according to the testimony of those who heard his Lowell Lectures, as to the dogmas and postulates of opposing schools of philosophy."[92]

[92] Harvard Graduates Whom I Have Known. By Andrew Preston Peabody. pp. 133-134.

President Eliot, in a personal letter, commenting on the sketch of Dr. Peabody, has given a different and more intimate interpretation of President Walker. He writes:

"As a young officer in the fifties, I took and followed more advice from Dr. Walker than from any other man. In dealing with a person in whom he had confidence, he was never non-committal, or irresolute, or dilatory. He easily postponed subjects in which he had no real interest, and I was sometimes much surprised to find that he had no interest in matters which to outsiders seemed likely to interest him very much. For instance, he received his theological training in the Harvard Divinity School, and took active part in the Unitarian controversy of which the Harvard Divinity School was an important fruit or result; and yet, when President, he tried to get the Divinity School transferred to a Unitarian Society in Boston, which was really established and preserved in order to found, build up, and to foster the Harvard Divinity School. That is, he tried to detach the Divinity School from Harvard University, and abandon it to a feeble, new, and almost unknown local

In the exercise of the judicial force and temperament, the president ever finds it well to see and to emphasize the points of agreement in all opposing causes and conflicting arguments. These points are most easily found by transferring antagonistic opin-

society. I distinctly remember my astonishment, when I discovered one evening after supper, in Dr. Walker's study, that he took no interest whatever in the Divinity School.

"I think that was true in regard to all the questions or public issues concerning which Dr. Peabody represents Dr. Walker as neutral or non-committal. He did not take much interest in them. Toward some of the Harvard abolitionists or Free Soilers of that day, Dr. Walker felt a distinct antipathy; so that he wanted to have nothing to do with them. He just avoided them. In the College Faculty from 1853 to 1861 there were several aggressive professors who disliked each other, and were often obstreperous in Faculty meetings. Dr. Walker never took sides in such disputes, and always tried to pour oil on the troubled waters; but that was because he wanted to make peace and keep it, not because he was non-committal.

"Everything that Dr. Peabody says about Dr. Walker's preaching is just and accurate. It was extraordinarily compact and cogent. For effectiveness on the spot and later I have never listened to any preaching as good as Dr. Walker's; and there was nothing in it which suggested indecision or a desire to hedge.

"I recall, at this moment, what I think was the last piece of advice that Dr. Walker ever gave me. Riding down Sparks Street—where Dr. Walker lived—one day in the early seventies, my horse fell with me in front of Dr. Walker's door, and I was covered with mud, on my right side, from head to foot. I had known the maid in Dr. Walker's house for many years; so I ventured to ring the bell, and ask her for a towel to wipe the mud off my clothes and the leg of my boot. While I was using the

ions into broader and more embracing unities. Such a habit of mind belonged to Leigh of King's College, of whom it is said:

"He had a singular gift of holding men together, of being able to work with all, while never keeping any shade of any opinion."[93] "He had . . . in a singular degree, the power of conciliating opposition, and of drawing men of different dispositions into harmony, if not into agreement."[94] "He had a way of going for the points of agreement among his fellow-workers, which was eminently helpful."[95]

### 4. Foresight

With yet another intellectual gift, quite unlike the judicial, should the president be endowed, namely,

towel on the doorstep, she went in and told the Doctor what had happened. Whereupon I received an imperative message to come in to his library. He first said: 'Mr. Eliot, how many times has this horse fallen down with you?' I confessed that he had fallen down with me twice before, but not so heavily. He replied: 'Mr. Eliot, the first time that horse fell down with you it was his fault; every time since it has been your fault.' I took the point and sold the horse at auction, requiring the auctioneer to announce that the owner would give no warranty of any kind with the horse. I sent a friend to the sale to see that that notice was given. There was nothing undecided or hesitating about Dr. Walker on that occasion."—Letter from Charles W. Eliot, January 24, 1923, to the author.

[93] Augustus Austen Leigh, Provost of King's College, Cambridge. Edited by William Austen Leigh. p. 297.

[94] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

foresight. He is to be, as I have already said, a prudent man in the original sense of the adjective. He is to have the vision of the seer and the voice of the prophet. This foresight is to be broad, as well as far. It is to be applied to fields no less diverse than finance and scholarship, than politics and religion, than education and labor. His foresight, of course, relates to problems academic, but these problems take on manifold relationships. For instance: Are hard financial times ahead which shall necessitate curtailment of plans for endowment? What are to be the immediate and permanent demands of the community for the education of its sons and daughters? Will the demand for scientific instruction become more emphatic? Will the foundation of new universities enlarge or endanger the usefulness of universities already established? Is there a lack of fresh and integrating forces in the faculty? Does the prospect of the "junior college" lay upon the university peculiar obligations? Does the urban university owe to its community heavy duties which it has not yet weighed? Should the demand for endowment with the purpose of a proper increase of the stipends of teachers be made superior to the demand for further equipment in libraries, laboratories and dormitories? Such are types of the problems of the future to which a president is to give wisest consideration and to offer prophetic judgment. His foresight is to be applied to affairs both within and without the college gates. For these two

classes of affairs impinge upon each other. But his immediate foresight is to be especially used in the academic conditions. To one condition he is peculiarly liable to be blind. This is the capacity or tendency of a faculty and of its members to wear out. Teachers lose their alertness, vigor, resiliency. They come to be less efficient, less influential. The academic routine may hide from the president the sad fact. But he is yet to know and to feel that, as chemical and physical apparatus rust out or wear out, so also do teachers of chemistry and of physics, and that as laboratories lose their adaptability and value, so no less do teachers. His understanding prepares, or should prepare, the way for the renewal of human, even more than of material, forces. Of course, it may be said in passing that he is not to be blind to the fact that he himself is wearing out. Like a good gold mine, he is paying out his capital in constant dividends.

Such foresight also represents the putting off of "college blinkers," which Pattison once spoke of himself as wearing. Pattison was guilty; as he says: "I was so proud of the success which had attended my own exertions as tutor that I could not as yet see beyond that narrow point of view." [96]

This sense of foresight is manifest in a power which I shall call appreciation of the worth of institutional constructiveness. The president is to have the instinct of understanding and appreciating the

[96] Memoirs. By Mark Pattison. p. 256.

great influences of the future,—and the great future influences are to be institutional. His mind is to be of the cathedral type. He is a builder, and a builder of an institution which gives promise of enduring. Men come and men go. Man survives. Humanity is the most enduring of all institutions. Humanity, as embodied in the university, will endure as long as the race itself. The sense which Washington, as president,—and the great contemporaries of his time,—felt, that they were laying the foundations of a lasting commonwealth, is to possess and to rule him. Draper was a unique constructive force in the University of Illinois, and in the educational foundations of the state of New York. The president of a new university, like Johns Hopkins, like Chicago, like Stanford, feels this quickening sense of laying foundations. The president, too, of an ancient institution, like Harvard, like William and Mary, like Yale, appreciates the same sense as he builds another story on top of the old and dear walls.

### 5. Leadership

Such foresight is indeed a comprehensive duty of the president in relation to the future and permanent conditions and forces of the college in which he is the chief officer. But it is also his duty as guide to know the present year and the immediate field in which his college is set. Such general knowledge is as important to him as the knowledge of the field of a forthcoming battle is important to the generals of the armies soon

to be engáged. His immediate policy of administration is influenced, if not determined, by his knowledge of existing conditions. A wise president, in an address made before his inauguration, said that he had no policies to announce: he wished to study the field. After such study, he hoped to be able to announce a program. The conditions of a state university, like that of Ohio or of Indiana, are unlike those of an incorporated university, and the conditions of an incorporated university of a national type are unlike those of a denominational college, like Wooster, Bucknell, or Kenyon. The conditions, too, of different colleges of the same class in different parts, are unlike. The field of the University of Arizona is unlike the field occupied by the University of Illinois, and both are unlike the field of the University of Texas or of Kentucky. The president is to know his immediate field, environment, history, possibilities, and from his knowledge he is to deduce policies. He is, no less, to seek to understand the future conditions. Future conditions help to determine to-day's policies.

The prudence of the college president has an illustration in the foresight which Delane, the great editor of *The Times*, exercised in regard to biographical sketches. Going away for a vacation, he had the practice of taking along "the proofs of necrologies awaiting their victims, to revise them personally and bring them up to date." [97] Dasent also says: "In the case

[97] John Thadeus Delane, Editor of *The Times*: His Life and Correspondence. By Arthur Irwin Dasent, Vol. II, p. 10.

of public men who exceeded the allotted span of life, biographies were kept standing in type; and the greater part of the memoir of Lord Brougham which appeared in *The Times* had been written thirty years before by William Stowe, the correspondent who died of fever at Balaclava. . . . We do not suppose that there have been many instances in which the epitaph of a great public man, appearing on the day of his decease, was mainly the work of a man himself long since dead."[98]

In the manifold advice which Machiavelli gives to his "Prince," is a characteristic counsel touching this virtue:

"The Romans did . . . what all prudent princes ought to do, who have to regard not only present troubles, but also future ones, for which they must prepare with every energy, because, when foreseen, it is easy to remedy them; but if you wait until they approach, the medicine is no longer in time because the malady has become incurable; for it happens in this, as the physicians say it happens in hectic fever, that in the beginning of the malady it is easy to cure but difficult to detect, but in the course of time, not having been either detected nor treated in the beginning, it becomes easy to detect but difficult to cure. Thus it happens in affairs of state, for when the evils that arise have been foreseen (which it is only given to a wise man to see), they can be quickly redressed, but when, through

[98] *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

not having been foreseen, they have been permitted to grow in a way that every one can see them, there is no longer a remedy.'' [99]

Such a foresight leads to, and is created by, a further characteristic element, namely, leadership,—a force to which I have already referred. Leadership is both an intellectual effort and a volitional virtue. It represents, among other forces and qualities, understanding of the conditions under which one leads, a seeing of the goal toward which one leads, a recognition of the difficulties which surround the leading, and sympathy with the hosts who are led. The executive leadership, which is needed keenly and appreciated deeply in the general community, is needed even more keenly and appreciated even more deeply in the academic. In the college, as among the people of a democracy, the leadership is to be neither autocratic nor aristocratic. It is to be democratic, yet definite and decisive. It is to be progressive, yet not radical; to represent the past and to gather up its offerings, yet to be neither stagnant nor indolent. It is to respect all classes concerned. It is to be popular, yet not to be vague. It is to be personal, yet not partial; strong, yet not wild; articulate, yet neither declamatory nor vociferous.

There is one element in this leadership of which special mention should be made. It relates to his own personal generosity. It is a leadership which the

[99] The Prince. By Nicolo Machiavelli. Translated by W. K. Marriott. pp. 21-22 (Everyman's Library).

president should not usually be allowed to assume, but it is one which he also frequently thinks it wise to accept. Sturtevant, that valiant president of Illinois College from 1844 to 1876, says: "At the annual meeting of the trustees that year I proposed that we should begin with an effort to raise a fund of ten thousand dollars none of the subscription to be valid until the full sum should have been pledged. Before the meeting adjourned the plan was put in form and two subscriptions of $1,000 each and several smaller ones were recorded. My own subscription of one thousand dollars was to be paid in ten equal annual installments, but the amount was at least equal to one-fourth of all my worldly possessions."[100] William Greenleaf Eliot, of Washington University, St. Louis, assumed a like financial leadership: "As a first step in the movement [of increasing the endowment fund], I have prepared a subscription paper, to which I have myself subscribed $50,000 payable July 1, 1885, or whenever the full amount of $500,000 is secured. . . . I would do more if I could, most gladly, but this comes nearer the extreme limit of prudence than I would ask or wish any one else to go. To me, however, it would be no sacrifice, but rather a cheap release from the anxiety and care of my present official life."[101] Of

[100] Julian M. Sturtevant: An Autobiography. Edited by his son, J. M. Sturtevant, Jr., p. 270.

[101] William Greenleaf Eliot. By Charlotte C. Eliot. pp. 120-121.

Pepper of Pennsylvania it is said: "In doing this [enlarging the university] he was compelled often to assume great financial obligations himself. This he did as no other educator in our country has ever done. The more peremptory became the demands of the great school under his care, the more actively he gave himself to the practice of his profession. Thus he earned great sums which he expended for the welfare of the University. Contributing generously himself, he was able to influence others to contribute, and thus to secure the means for carrying out his academic plans." [102]

"To carry out these plans Dr. Pepper raised above ten million dollars and secured about a hundred acres of land from the municipality, lying near the heart of Philadelphia. To the execution of this task he gave the service of one of the most acute and at the same time most practical minds ever vouchsafed to man. To this service of his genius he added the personal gift of nearly half a million dollars, which he earned in the practice of an exacting profession. It may be doubted whether any other American has run a like career." [103]

Such a leadership the great Quincy of Harvard also gave in his formative administration.

[102] William Pepper, M.D., LL.D. By Francis Newton Thorpe. pp. 363-364.

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 460.

### 6. Energy

It is almost painfully evident that such financial leadership on the part of the president springs from and contributes to a further element of his character, the element of energy. Energy stands both for physical health, of which I have just written as of primary worth, and for intellectual forcefulness. In a president it represents the volitional, as well as the mental, gift. It intimates the ablest personal and official character. It indicates valor and lucidity. It represents the dynamic quality. It stands for initiative. It is the opposite of disability, infirmity, invalidism, indolence. It is to be distinguished from rashness, and from noisiness which is easily interpreted as unreasoned progress. It is a virtue of peculiar need in a president. For academic boards, as I have already intimated, are usually inclined to conservatism. They are prone to play safe. They are not willing to take risks. They are more apt to be content with letting their college do well, than to venture, under certain perils indeed, to urge it to be and to do yet better. If a president be willing to adopt such a conservative policy, the college consequently walks in the old paths, cultivates the fields that have long been cultivated, and presently becomes rather a memorial institution than a vital force quickening the community. If the president be possessed of energy,—a gift not free from perils, as I shall presently intimate,—progress is promised, adjustment to new duties is made, the realization of

visions higher and broader is assured, and entrance into waiting opportunities is secured. Of such energy, Pepper was the incarnation. As he once said to me, "The University of Pennsylvania went to sleep after its birth, and remained asleep until I became president. It then waked up and there has been trouble ever since!" It is said of him: "The last three years of Dr. Pepper's life were years of sleeplessness, pain, and intensity of application. Not seldom does he speak of having no sleep for thirty-six hours or of working from fourteen to nineteen hours consecutively . . . 'I awoke at dawn and read Aurelius,' he writes. 'I am stronger and calmer than I ventured to hope that I should be for a long time, and I begin to have that clear inner light as to the future which is always common to me when assured of a successful and right course of action. I shall never give myself one moment's worry again about slanderous criticism or treacherous opposition. I know I have the strength to carry through a second life of large labor and achievement. I feel the fire and ambition of youth coming back.'"[104] "His spells of sickness were shaken off by will power rather than by medicine or rest. He refused to be sick, though his work was enough to break down any man. Even when for a day he was confined to his bed, he maintained his hope and serenity, and gently rebuked an anxious friend: 'Never allow one moment to be spoiled by anxiety.

[104] William Pepper, M.D., LL.D. By Francis Newton Thorpe. pp. 473-474.

What is the use of our hard-won upland of clear sky and pure air if we let fogs obscure?'" [105] "On one occasion, at a theatre-party which he was giving, after some fifteen minutes, he excused himself, and was gone three-quarters of an hour. Remaining a short time, he excused himself again, and was gone nearly as long. He then returned for a moment, and excused himself a third time. He had appeared at three functions, at two of which he had made formal addresses; the third disappearance was for a consultation. While under great pressure of work he occasionally worked thirty-six or even forty-eight hours without interruption except for a bite of food. This was in the last five years of his life, while he was devoting all his energies to civil affairs." [106]

Possessed of similar energy was Harper of Chicago, who laid foundations and built thereon, in a decade, worthy of a long administration. The ripeness of the opportunity, the generosity of the founder, and the power and efficiency of his co-workers, rich as all these forces were, should not be permitted to depreciate the greatness of his achievements.

In this field of energy are found two other elements closely allied to each other and which are manifestations of constituent parts of energy. They are courage and initiative. The president is to be bold in conception and endeavor, yet not too bold. The first president of Vassar College, Raymond, had

[105] *Ibid.*, p. 476.
[106] *Ibid.*, p. 458.

courage, but it was a courage tempered with humility. In accepting the presidency, he says:

"It is needless to say that I have reached this conclusion not without exceeding diffidence of my ability to meet the too generous expectations of my friends, a diffidence which reflection rather increases than diminishes. As other objections and obstacles have been successively removed, this has grown upon me, and at times been almost overpowering. If I have not allowed it to determine me to an opposite conclusion, it is because I find a counterbalancing encouragement in the character of the men whose support is pledged to me, and am not forbidden to seek wisdom and strength from Him to whose honor this venture is devoted, and who is abundantly able to supplement every deficiency, and to give increase and ample fruitage to the humblest germs of promise."[107]

Mark Pattison of Lincoln was likewise moved. In him both energy and humility were well united:

"I had from youth up a restless desire to be always improving myself, other people, all things, all received ways of doing anything. This was a mental instinct which lay far below any adopted opinions in politics, and has been a cause of no little trouble to me. It is impossible for me to see anything done without an immediate suggestion of how it might be better done. I cannot travel by railway without working out in my mind a better time-table than that

[107] Life and Letters of John Howard Raymond. p. 515.

in use. On the other hand, this restlessness of the critical faculty has done me good service when turned upon myself. I have never enjoyed any self-satisfaction in anything I have ever done, for I have inevitably made a mental comparison with how it might have been better done."[108]

This need of the spirit of progressiveness and aggressiveness, born of courage and initiative, becomes more emphatic by reason, as I have intimated, of the natural and proper conservativeness of the boards of trust. Yet this spirit is not to become so advancing as to give alarm to the president's directing and devoted associates. I chance to know of a wise and loyal trustee,—to whom and to his co-trustees a president, also loyal, was making an argument and appeal for taking an advanced position,—saying in reply: "Suppose we don't pass this in order to prevent the president from rushing on so fast!"

### 7. Optimism

With these allied forces of leadership and of energy is united the quality and force of optimism. The president is to be possessed of this superb virtue and grace. It is to clothe him as a garment; to surround him as an atmosphere. Great presidents possess it as they are great, or rather it possesses them according to their greatness. Porter of Yale was its embodiment. President Franklin Carter says of him:

[108] Memoirs. By Mark Pattison. p. 254.

"He was an optimist, if I ever knew one. He had a large trust in human nature, and confidence in the ultimate ascendancy of reason, in hours when reason was trampled on by bigotry or theological bitterness; a firm belief that if history teaches anything it teaches that truth is to have dominion. His optimism went so far as to lead him sometimes to believe that influences which to most seemed destructive were really conservative and helpful. It was not easy for him to conceive that any conditions with which he had to deal were, I will not say, wholly bad, but other than fairly good. In every crisis he saw signs for hope, and out of every disaster he expected good to come. It was often hard for others to see on what his confidence was resting, but after observation for a considerable period of time, the conviction came to the observer that such a faith was far wiser than apprehension or alarm."[109]

That valiant soul, Joseph Ward, founder of Yankton College, was, like most pioneering presidents, endowed with this gift:

"The organization of the College had been carried thus to completion mainly as a work of faith. The enterprise was supremely characteristic of Joseph Ward, whose rule of action in all affairs was to first make sure that a thing ought to be done, in other words that God wanted it done, and then to *begin*

[109] Noah Porter: A Memorial by Friends. "President of Yale." By President Franklin Carter. p. 144.

doing it at once, having no doubt as to its ultimate success."[110]

### 8. Patience

But energy and its allied forces, without another virtue which is also a grace, may be as a swiftly rushing stream which either soon exhausts itself, or easily becomes a force destructive and devastating. That virtue and that grace, of which I already have written, is patience, which is as supreme as the love which the apostle Paul constantly commends. There is need of intellectual patience to explain and to interpret new and untried policies to the members of a faculty and of a board of trust. For, subjects which, by reason of his own long reflection and deep interest, are plain and compelling to a president, may to the members of the official bodies be obscure and foreign in interest and appeal. There is need of emotional, as well as of intellectual, patience. For, to the president, the one new movement which he desires to launch must take its place in the minds of the members of the boards with several other movements to which they are already committed and which may seem to them equally commanding of their benediction and beneficence. There is a need further of volitional patience. For, the reasoning, reflection, and feeling which have brought the president to the goal

[110] Joseph Ward of Dakota. By George Harrison Durand. p. 131.

of his conclusion are rational and emotional roadways which his official associates are still to travel. Often their progress is slow. Their vision of the goal may be hidden by their appreciation of the byways of academic duty; and indeed their mood of doubtfulness and questioning may make the whole academic journey serious, slow, and perplexing. There is need, moreover, of moral patience. For, the ethical values of a college education may not seem so imperative to the president's associates as to himself. There is need also of what I may call communal patience. For, the president is aflame with a desire to make the college of ever increasing worth to the community. "So much is to be done to lift the standards of the town, city, state, to provide social and civil instruction and improvement, to create resources in the lives of citizens,"—thus he exclaims to himself in the sleepless watches of the night. Such were the feelings of that executive genius, Cyrus Hamlin, in seeking, for several years, to get the right for Robert College—as it afterwards came to be known—simply to be founded. Such also were his emotions, after the right was given, in collecting money, often in small sums, in both Turkey and America, for the laying of the foundations. Alas! no such fires, the president often finds, are burning in the bosoms of the members either of the faculty or of the board of trustees. He is obliged to wait until the Davidic musing has ceased and the fires are burning for the speaking with tongues, or for the writing of checks. The lack of

such patience, of manifold type and obligation, is the one chief cause of the brevity of presidencies. Long presidencies, like that of Nott of Union, of Hopkins of Williams, of Cheney of Bates, illustrate and incarnate this virtue. Whewell, despite his great powers, lacked it, as also did Robinson of Brown. One of the most alarming of all instances of the lack of this central virtue is found in the history of the University of Cincinnati and a stormy presidency. The value of the virtue of patience has a noble interpretation in Lowell's lines on Columbus:

"Endurance is the crowning quality,
And patience all the passion of great hearts:
These are their stay, and when the leaden world
Sets its hard face against their fateful thought,
And brute strength like a scornful conqueror
Clangs his huge mace down in the other scale,
The inspired soul but flings his patience in,
And slowly that outweighs the ponderous globe,—
One faith against a whole world's unbelief,
One soul against the flesh of all mankind."

### 9. Adaptability

As a necessary part of patience is the power and quality of adjustment, or of adaptability. The president is to create relationships proper, under conditions in which relationships improper could easily be made. He is to bring agreements out of disagreements, to make fitnesses from unfitnesses, to get satisfactions out of dissatisfactions. Raising grapes from thorns and figs from thistles is his function.

He is to adjust individualities to the standards of a board, to placate the cantankerous, to influence the proud and the bumptious to work with humility and modesty, and to persuade the crude and the coarse to live in peace with the urbane and the mannerly. Boards of trustees and faculties are composed of personalities, and these personalities are often individualistic. These boards themselves frequently embody almost contradictory forms of academic tradition and procedure. These personalities he is to seek to fit into each other, and unto large, efficient, noble progressiveness and ripe fruitfulness. If the proposed donor of a building, for instance, desires a certain architect and is set upon a certain type of architecture, the type being inconsistent with other types found upon the "lawn" or in the "yard," he is to seek to bring the donor into sympathy with the judgments of the board without irritation, and also by all means without losing the building. If a donor wishes to make a gift for the founding of a new school of the university, and if the amount of the proposed gift is clearly insufficient, or indeed if the school be not needed, he is to enlighten the generous giver with a vision larger and truer, seeking another result which ultimately shall give deeper satisfaction to the donor, and which shall still further promote the cause of liberal learning. The method for securing results so greatly desired lies in the lifting of the thought of those concerned with a noble project to a yet higher level, and in giving to the judgment of

those who make decisions a broader and a clearer understanding of relationships. No president embodied, with greater fullness or richer charm, this power of adjustment than Angell of Michigan. This power is well set forth in his interpretation of the great ends he had permanently in view, in the several relations of the university to the state:

"First: I have endeavored to induce every citizen to regard himself as a stockholder in the Institution, who had a real interest in helping make it of the greatest service to his children and those of his neighbours.

"Secondly: I have sought to make all the schools and teachers in the State understand that they and the University are parts of one united system and that therefore the young pupil in the most secluded schoolhouse in the State should be encouraged to see that the path was open from his home up to and through the University." [111]

### 10. Conciliatoriness

Among the qualities of the president, quite akin to adaptability, is also one which I shall call conciliation. Conciliation moves in the individual between unrestrained, selfish freedom, on the one side, and personal antagonism to others and opposition to their principles, on the other. It seeks to draw together opposites, opposites in either personality, or theory, or causes, or movements. It tries to find a method

[111] The Reminiscences of James Burrill Angell. p. 255.

which will work on, and with, materials which do not normally unite in efficiency, and under conditions which do not usually coalesce unto good service. Conciliation is not neutrality but coefficiency; not indifference, but sympathy; not separateness, but unity. It is as far off from intolerance as it is from swift and soft acquiescence. It has several origins. In point of intellect, it springs from seeing the fundamental principles held in common. In point of feeling, it arises from a personal appreciation of, or even an affection for, those who may differ in belief, or are antagonistic in ways of administration. In point of conscience, it is caused by recognition of the fact that others, too, have moral convictions quite as firmly held as are the articles of one's own ethical creed. In point of will, it is moved by an altruistic purpose to achieve a comprehensive and consummate result. It stands for largeness of thought, for breadth of reflection, for a sense of proportional values, for remoteness from captiousness, for responsiveness to the call of human service. Conciliation is first cousin, but not a twin sister, of compromise. Compromise is each giving up something, and a consequent uniting upon another something which no party to it regards as the best. Conciliation is the finding and adopting of a plan better than any plan previously proposed. Compromise is an immediate method for wiping out antagonistic conditions and for leveling obstructions. Conciliation is a permanent policy for permanent co-working and co-achieving.

In plan and achievement, conciliation often means the substitution of the informal for the formal, of the personal for the theoretical, of the principle for the hidden application, and of the clear and manifest application for the doubtful, or hidden, one. It is an active virtue, as is seen in the earlier years of the presidency of Kirkland of Harvard, and not a passive one as was evidenced in the later period of his Augustan administration.

Conciliation belongs to all fields and forms of human administration,—governmental, ecclesiastical, educational. Writing from London to House, in November, 1915, Walter Hines Page said:

"More and more I am struck with this—that governments are human. They are not remote abstractions, nor impersonal institutions. Men conduct them; and they do not cease to be men. A man is made up of six parts of human nature and four parts of facts and other things—a little reason, some prejudice, much provincialism, and of the particular fur or skin that suits his habitat. When you wish to win a man to do what *you* want him to do, you take along a few well-established facts, some reasoning and such-like, but you take along also three or four or five parts of human nature—kindness, courtesy, and such things—sympathy and a human touch.

"If a man be six parts human and four parts of other things, a government, especially a democracy, is seven, or eight, or nine parts human nature. It's the most human thing I know. The best way to

manage governments and nations—so long as they are disposed to be friendly—is the way we manage one another."[112]

What Page says with his usual clearness and aptness, is true of academic administration. Courtesy, conciliation, represent both the mood and the act. The president possessing, or possessed by, the conciliatory mood gives himself to the doing of acts of conciliation. It might be asked whether the act or the mood is the more important. The act is important as specially evidenced in academic and other crises. But the mood is yet more important, as it is the more lasting. Out of the mood, too, springs the act whenever the occasion arises. Such a mood the president is ever to cultivate. Such a mood lessens the antagonisms that are sure to arise between strong, vigorous personalities. Such a mood helps to dissipate a lack of confidence in the president which at least occasionally is felt, and may be made manifest. It also serves to mediate between opposing policies, seeking to find a more comprehensive method, and one better than any opposing plan or system. The mood of adaptability and conciliatoriness, therefore, is of the highest worth. It is to be made consistent with firmness and with allegiance to fundamental principles. Firmness is never to be suffered to become mere obstinacy in disposition, or obstructiveness in method. Loyalty to principles of administration, united with

[112] The Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page. By Burton J. Hendrick. Vol. II, pp. 73-74.

a regard for details which is liquid, represents the best condition. Such was the mood of Angell of Michigan, who sought, for instance,—by suggesting changes in formal, written documents,—to bring about agreements between discordant factions. Such, also, was the mood of White of Cornell, who always endeavored, through his gracious personality and interpretation, to create atmospheres in which men reasoned by general processes unto similar conclusions. Such, too, was the mood of Northrop of Minnesota, and of Gilman of Johns Hopkins.

Such was not, however, the mood of Woodrow Wilson as president of Princeton. He embodied qualities of firmness amounting to stubbornness which resulted in divisions in the faculty and in the board of trustees. Some would add that such a division was, under the conditions, inevitable and necessary. It certainly was at least an evil condition of college government, and a misfortune, even if temporary, for Princeton. Of course, at all hazards, it resulted in sending Woodrow Wilson to the governor's chair of New Jersey, and thence to the White House. Some would add that the process represents the old Calvinistic doctrine of the overruling of men's evil purposes for the good of the world.

It was a lack of this conciliatory spirit, also, which made Kitchener, with all his unique power, quite as much a liability as an asset to his government and his country, in the first months of the Great War. Having dwelt so long with, and governed, inferior

and subject peoples, he had become an autocrat. He, therefore, was unable to consult, in a proper mood, with equals and superiors. Team work is as essential in college administration as it was foreign to Kitchener as commander. If he lacked vision, as it has been said he did, he had an instinct for authority too autocratic. If he controlled himself as a master, a like masterfulness he exercised toward his associates.

The president, therefore, should have, as a part, and as a constant part, of his character, the power of getting on well with men. He is to be free from cantankerousness. Toward his official superiors,—and the members of the board of trustees are to be so regarded,—he should have an innate and manifest attitude of respect, and without servility. This attitude should be normal and natural. Toward his official subordinates, he should also have respect, and without arrogance,—and this attitude, be it said, is not so common. For his equals, he should have liking, without either softness or hardness of heart. This attitude is not so common as one could wish. He is not indeed to be like Whewell, of whom it is said:

"'Whewell thinks himself a fraction of the universe, and wishes to make the denominator as small as possible.'[113] . . . If he saw no defect in a statute or a practice, no one else had any right to see one. Here is a specimen of the language he used respecting

[113] Old Friends at Cambridge and Elsewhere. By J. Willis Clark. p. 52.

the junior Fellows, all, it must be remembered, men of some distinction, whom he himself had had a hand in electing:

" 'It is a very sad evening of my College life, to have the College pulled in pieces and ruined by a set of schoolboys. It is very nearly that kind of work. The Act of Parliament gives all our Fellows equal weight for certain purposes, and the younger part of them all vote the same way, and against the Seniors. Several of these juveniles are really boys, several others only Bachelors of Arts, so we have crazy work, as I think of it.' "[114]

The president is associated with men of all sorts and conditions. He is to work with them at his best, ever seeking for their best, too. He is not to be all things to all men in a sense that he is to surrender his own individuality, but he is to be all things to all men through his own most distinct individuality in order to be of service to them. He may well ask that all men may bear of their best offerings to him, in order that he may restore their offerings to them in greater richness and larger amplitude. Tact, which is simply courtesy writ large, is to clothe him as a well fitting robe. He is not, however, to be like Pattison. He is not to lack a knowledge of the world and of its uses, as did the Lincoln master. Of himself, Pattison says:

"I was now thirty-eight, and much as I had advanced in knowledge, I had not equally advanced in

[114] *Ibid.*, p. 64.

knowing how to deal with men—men my equals, I mean, for the treatment of young men was then my specialty. But I was deficient in the ordinary tact which every man of the world has acquired long before he arrives at thirty-eight. I was conscious of this defect, and conscious also that in the life I was leading it was impossible for me to get over it.'' [115]

Tact also largely consists in the gift of appreciation. In possessing and using this gift the president emphasizes altruism rather than egotism, the merit of his associates rather than his own worth. He is simply to be a gentleman.

### 11. Institutional Accommodation

In getting on well with men, the president should illustrate the advantage of what might be called personal and institutional accommodation and agreement. He fits himself into conditions, permanent or transient. He has a just regard for tradition, yet not forgetting that the best of yesterday is to be transformed into a better worth of to-morrow. The qualities that promote agreements differ in the same institution in different epochs, and also may differ fundamentally in different institutions. The qualities that fit into institutional headships in the colleges on the Columbia River may not be so effectively adjusted to colleges on the Androscoggin or Kennebec. Jordan of Stanford advised Penniman of Whitman to hold a faculty meeting once a year. Such independ-

[115] Memoirs. By Mark Pattison. p. 264.

ence would not fit well into Bowdoin, or Colby, or Bates.[116]

[116] "The first reason alleged for the continuance of the present system of external legislation and autocratic administration is that college faculties are unable to do business. 'It goes without saying, and properly and without adverse criticism, that the temper of mind which turns a man to the higher forms of scholarship and to investigation and research is not the temper which fits him for executive work,' is the statement of a former university president, but it was made before the election of President Wilson. Another president finds that 'a faculty is made up chiefly of specialists, for the most part untrained in the business of administration and without special responsibility for the college and the larger relationships.' Still a third finds 'that a faculty that governs itself in an extreme degree is likely to be extremely conservative; it is likely to perpetuate traditions; it is likely not to be in touch with progressive thought,' though the danger to be anticipated from faculty government is, in the opinion of a fourth, 'its radical tendencies.' This difference in point of view may, however, be explained by the geographical location of the two institutions whose presidents have given these judgments—one is east and one is west. And yet another emphatic, unqualified statement is made that 'the very worst form of government for college or university is that of a faculty.'

"This very insistence on the inability of the corporate faculty thereby tends to make a faculty incompetent. That a man quickly becomes what he is thought to be has been learned in nearly every other field but that of normal education. Even those who deal with criminals are learning that the quickest way to make a man guilty of crime is to believe him capable of committing a crime, that trust and confidence win a wavering man to the side of law and order while suspicion and distrust send him to the side of lawlessness and crime. But no hope seems to be

There is a peculiar need of this virtue and grace of institutional accommodation on the part of the president in proposing new measures. Such measures may, and often do, kindle opposition. If the opposition be weighty, even if the measures be intrinsically wise, it is usually well to wait for enlightening reflection to do its proper work among those opposing. But, in any event, the mood or the desire for adjustment and agreement is of primary worth in securing the immediate purpose, and, what is far more important, in maintaining the sense of good fellowship and of mutual confidence.

held out for the college faculty—it ever hears from the platform and through the press that it is incapable of doing business and the discouraging feature of the situation is that the American college faculty is coming to believe it.

"It is also asserted that the college professor does not wish to take a larger part than he now has in the direction of educational policy. 'I have heard a good deal about the growing impatience at the amount of business detail forced on the faculty because of this faculty form of government,' is the statement made by a university president. 'By far the greatest number in every faculty neither desire to assume administrative burdens nor are extraordinarily competent for such tasks' is the opinion of another president. Even so eminent a man as ex-President Eliot has shown much solicitude on this point when he says:

" 'Most American professors of good quality would regard the imposition of duties concerning the selection of professors and other teachers, the election of the president and the annual arrangement of the budget of the institution as a serious reduction in the attractiveness of the scholar's life and the professional career.' "—The Next College President. By a Near-Professor. The Popular Science Monthly. Vol. LXXXIII, September, 1913. pp. 276-277.

### 12. Sense of Proportion

Closely affiliated with the quality of judgment, of energy, of patience, and of conciliation, is the sense of proportion. This sense of proportion is the foundation of the power of great achievement. The sense of values is important in each zone of life, and in none is it more important, or necessary, than in the academic. In the academic, in fact, it is absolutely necessary. The sense of proportion should be keenly and fully understood. For, proportion represents the understanding of relationships. It means giving most to that which deserves most; it means giving least to that which deserves least. It stands for a proper division of one's tasks. It intimates a proper union of depth and breadth in one's thinking and choosing. It is conjugating problems in the tenses, moods, and voices that belong to one's time and conditions. It includes a fair adjustment between intellectual concerns and executive duties, between solitude and companionships, between present interests and future responsibilities. Going too far one way, one cannot go far enough another. I knew a distinguished teacher of Greek, many years ago, who read with his class Aristotle's "Politics." Even in this thought-creating interpretation and instruction the matter of moods and tenses was chiefly significant. Governmental analogies and applications were entirely neglected. Moods and tenses are important, but they are not the only or even the chief parts in advanced classical study.

Some officers, to illustrate still further the value of a sense of proportion, are good outside presidents, representing well the college to the community, yet neglecting the daily routine with associates and students. Others are good inside presidents, doing the duties of the desk and of the conference room, yet neglecting the public relations. Some are good interpreters and expositors of academic principles, both within and without the gates, but passing over lightly all details of executive service. Others are masters of detail, but they fail to see the stars of the college firmament. Many great presidents indeed seem to embody "splendid contradictions."

### 13. Constructive Conservatism

Another quality in the president, comprehensive of many qualities, represents a union of the pioneer and of the constructive conservative. The president is to be a Columbus, a Balboa, who is to sail educational seas which are uncharted, to avoid unmarked shoals and rocks, and to steer out into the latitudes and longitudes in which the stars and the sun furnish his only reckoning. He is yet not to be guilty either of rashness or of obstinacy. He is never to risk the safety of his academic craft. Such a pilot was Gilman in both Berkeley and Baltimore. With this method of justifiable pioneering is to be joined a sense of constructive conservatism. Conservatism is in peril of not being constructive. It is open to the

challenge of being stagnant and stolid. The college is sometimes spoken of as a pleasant back-water of American life. The president is to cause the college to represent the proper type, even the swift movements, of all humanity. He is to build out of the materials which the past offers, through the methods which by experience have been proved effective, and unto a structure which shall be a treasure-house of achievement, a monument of reason, a temple of worship, a workshop of service, and a home for humanity.

The characteristics which I have already considered are rather of an intellectual type. I now wish to pass over to a type of characteristics somewhat emotional. In the relation of the heart one finds at least two qualities of primary worth.

### 14. Respect and Love

The president should be able to call out instinctively the elements of respect from all his associates. He should also, if that be possible, win the feeling and the will of love. The two qualities of respect and of love, of course, may be distinct. Respect is earlier in time, and may continue without the other virtue or grace. To most presidents is given respect, although many able and distinguished presidents do not receive it of all their associates. However, I now think of only few presidents to whom it was not given. To one of the more notable I already have referred, as found in the attitude which Moses Coit Tyler held

toward Charles Kendall Adams.[117] The number of those who naturally command and deserve the deepest loyalty of their associates is of course far greater than the number of those who do not warrant it. Instances of devotion to their presidents, on the part of professorial associates, are as common as are found among the subordinates of great editors or of great military or naval commanders.

A common and virulent cause of lack of respect is found in the simple element of deceptiveness or of definite lying. The virtue of truth-telling, which might be interpreted by the two words, candor and frankness, should especially belong to the president. The virtue is intellectual, as well as ethical. There should be nothing to conceal in the mood or attitude of a president toward his fellow officers, or toward the community interested in the university. Secret diplomacy is out of place.

But the virtue is, in the opinion of many people, more frequently and more disastrously honored in the college breach than in the college observance. For, the race of presidents has the misfortune of being called lying, and members of it are frequently and distinctly declared to be liars. In fact, one great president has said of himself, in unique humor, that against him the offense had been proved! One of the most lamentable and disastrous of all college quarrels,

[117] Moses Coit Tyler, 1835-1900: Selections from His Letters and Diaries, Made and Edited by Jessica Tyler Austen, pp. 249-253.

of trustees and of faculty, had its origin in the apparent falsehoods told by the president to the trustees.

The reasons of the reputation lie in several causes, and causes, too, of diverse classification.

One reason is found in the esteem in which the office is held. The office demands,—and usually the demand is met,—a telling of the truth. Whenever there occurs any deviation from the straight line, the moral crookedness becomes marked, most marked. The conspicuousness of the office, and the consequent distinction of the officer, give to a falsehood, or to any falsity, a special sense of intellectual and moral blameworthiness.

But, moreover, the reputation arises from the actual, even if only occasional, lapse. The normal president desires to promote his causes, to bring his ideas to pass, to secure his far-off or immediate purposes. In such a process and progress, the action of at least two boards is usually necessary. In his presentation of his causes, he may use with the two bodies arguments somewhat different, and so different that the inference is easily drawn that he is not entirely frank and candid. His arguments for or against the building of a dormitory, for instance, which have special significance for a faculty, may have scanty meaning for a board of trustees. A statement which is made to the board is withheld from the faculty, and the argument which is offered to the faculty is not submitted to the board. Emerson somewhere says, "Truth has so many facets that the

best we can do is to notice each in turn without troubling ourselves whether they agree.'' But such diversities easily lay a foundation for the charge of unworthy concealment or of prevarication.

The diversity of presentation of a cause holds relations to the diversities, moreover, found in the president's own mental and moral constitution. The president is, or has, a many-sided mind. He ought thus to be or to have. John Morley once assented to my interpretation of the cause of the reputation of Mr. Gladstone as deceptive being found in the many-sidedness of his character. Gladstone, the prime minister, was unlike Gladstone, the devout and devoted churchman, and both were unlike his character as an Homeric interpreter. The beholder, seeing only one side of the mental polyhedron, inferred that the other sides did not exist. The president, called on to exercise diverse functions and to use powers often seemingly contradictory, lays himself open to the charge of falsifying facts, of giving diverse or contradictory interpretation of facts, of being himself a man of deceiving character.

Be it also said that the college conditions lend themselves to the incurring of this guilt far more readily than do the ordinary material and physical conditions which constitute the larger share of life. The college conditions are concerned with persons, problems, forces, of a type not purely intellectual, as well as with those purely intellectual. They, therefore, do not easily give themselves to direct, exact,

full statement. They allow suggestions. They create atmospheres. They permit degrees of interpretation far more readily than do the problems and conditions of manufacturing or of merchandising. They invite debate, arguing, objecting, denying. The president, who is often called upon to be either the stabilizing or the kinetic force in such discussions, is easily judged guilty of lacking frankness, or of a change of opinion, or of general instability. The instability easily leads to the reputation of dissimulation, dissimulation to the charge of prevarication, and prevarication to an indictment for the darker offenses.

Of course, with the president, as with all men, the primary cause of lying is timidity. The president is afraid. He is afraid for his office, for his college, for himself. He need not be afraid. He should not be afraid. The only thing he should be afraid of, to change Mary Lyon's remark, is that he will not do his whole duty in telling the whole truth.

Most presidents, like most gentlemen, are candid and frank. Any other course is suicidal. The presidents who have been guilty have suffered terms either brief or tempestuous, or both. The names of such presidents easily come to the lip, or to the pen's point. In the nature of things no other conclusion than either brevity of his term, or stormy weather, or occasional cyclones, during its continuance, is possible.

Both trustees and faculty, be it added, are helped by absolute candor on the part of their chief, and are

hurt by the fact of concealment or of deception. Lamentable illustrations of the harm wrought by either concealment or deception abound.

But, despite such conditions it is still true that the president usually commands the respect of his associates. Of course, it is his duty so to bear himself as to command respect. If he thus fail, one conclusion and only one is possible.

But, if respect for the president is absolutely necessary, love given to him and love given by him is still more precious, even if far less common. Love for him comes, of course, from his character and from another cause of which I shall presently write. The personal relation of the president to the students, and the personal relation which he holds to many individuals, is at once the cause and result of the deepest feeling. Among the college presidents who have called out this feeling of love most deeply are Day of Yale, Nott of Union, Mrs. Palmer of Wellesley, Northrop of Minnesota, and Tucker of Dartmouth.[118] Of Day it has been said:

"By reason of some singular chance, or the development of a peculiar era, the years near the middle point of his Presidency—1827 to 1832—brought disturbances, and even rebellions, into the undergraduate community, such as had never been known before and have happily never since been repeated. He proved himself fully adequate to meet

[118] Many a graduate would add the name of the president of his own college during his own four years.

the demand which these disorders created. The government was victorious, even though rigorous measures were carried so far that more than half of the membership of one of the classes was removed from the institution. Even when he adopted or approved the severest action, however, he had so much wisdom, and was recognized as being of so judicial and kindly a spirit, that the students at no time lost anything of their reverential regard or affection for him."[119]

Of Nott of Union it is written:

"To this his love for the young, and their reciprocally cherished remembrance of him, the annual commencement gatherings of Union College, now becoming more numerous than ever, bear warmest testimony. It was especially manifested in 1865, when Dr. Nott was in his ninety-third year, and the long array of classes passed before his mansion. As Judge Campbell so pathetically tells us in his letter, . . . 'the lamp of life had burned to the socket.' Its flame was feeble and flickering. He had to be supported at the open window as rank after rank filed before him with uncovered heads. He could not speak to them, but, though pain was stamped upon the countenance, the smile and glow of feeling were still there, deeply affecting the young, while drawing tears from aged eyes in that memorable procession."[120]

[119] Memories of Yale Life and Men. By Timothy Dwight. p. 43.

[120] Memoirs of Eliphalet Nott, D.D., LL.D. By C. Van Santvoord. p. 271.

A successor of Mrs. Palmer in the great presidency, said of her:

"We loved her for the loving thoughts which sped
Straight from her heart until they found their goal
In some perplexed or troubled human soul
And broke anew the ever living bread.
We loved the mind courageous which no dread
Of failure ever daunted, whose control
Of gentleness all opposition stole;
We loved herself and all the joy she shed.

Oh Leader of the Leaders! Like a light
Thy life was set, to counsel, to befriend;
Thy quick and eager insight seized the right
And shared the prize with bounteous hand, and free.
Fed from the fountains of infinity
Thy life was service, having love to spend." [121]

Than Tucker of Dartmouth, no president has been loved more deeply or by a larger number. With the love has gone along all the feelings of trustfulness and of confidence which love connotes.

We have evidence, moreover, that Porter, of Yale, was among the loved presidents of his generation. Of him, President Carter has said:

"It was not long before I discovered that, great as was his mastery of the machinery of the college, it was accompanied by a deep personal interest in all who were connected with this machinery either as

[121] Volume of Memorial Service of Alice Freeman Palmer: Address by Caroline Hazard. p. 57.

professors or students. Naturally the students, as the body brought together for the purposes of training, were the first element in his thought. But it was not that he looked at them as a great whole to be disciplined and improved, but he seemed to carry individuals in his mind and to act upon the principle that the progress attained must be progress by individuals."[122]

Love given by a president to his students or official associates calls out love from them, and love from them in turn usually evokes his own feeling.

The individual president may be a good president or a poor one in many relations, but he should always be the best friend to his associates. With them, the terms of association should be of the deepest personal regard. For their life and his life are one. Their purposes and his purposes are identical. Their atmospheres and his are the same. They are also the same, or should be, in their poverties or in their riches. I have heard college presidents say that they had to be remote from their associates in order to avoid the appearance of favoritism. One does not forget Gladstone's remark that "there are no friendships at the top." The fact, if it be a fact, however, is lamentable; the reasons, too, are absurd. The purpose of the method of remoteness, of course, is good. Impartiality is ever to be cultivated. But such a method

[122] Noah Porter, a Memorial by Friends: President of Yale. By President Franklin Carter. Edited by George S. Merriam. pp. 135-136.

is vain and void. A college president's character should be so large, his intellectual vision so broad, his conscience so keen and pure, and his heart so warm, that he may properly bear himself in intimate association as a great and worthy friend toward each of those with whom and for whom he serves.

Of course, as I have suggested, the cause of the love bestowed upon the president is his own love for associates and students. Like creates like. If he fail to love, he will not be loved. His heart is to be great without softness, tender without sentimentalism, appreciative without flattery, strong and deep in its emotions without coldness or narrowness. Such a feeling, both given forth and received, provides the best possible foundation for building executive service, and creates the best possible atmosphere for the transaction of all academic business. It is not only what lubricating oil is to the machine. It is also, and more, a force added to every machine for its effective running. General Robert E. Lee is not usually known as a college president, but he was one of the most loved and efficient of all the thousands, and the love he gave and accepted added greatly to his efficiency. Of him it is said:

"His interest in the students individually and collectively was untiring. By the system of reports made weekly to the president, and monthly to the parent or guardian, he knew well how each one of his charges was getting on, whether or not he was progressing, or even holding his own. If the report

was unsatisfactory, the student was sent for and remonstrated with. If that had no effect, the parents were advised, and requested to urge the son to try to do better. If the student still persisted in wasting his time and money, his parents were asked to call him home. . . . He won the confidence of the students, and very soon their affections. He regarded a mass of petty regulations as being only vexatious, and yet by his tact and firmness his discipline became most effective. Very seldom was there any breaking of the laws. He was so honoured and loved that they tried to please him in all things."[123]

To these primary elements, uniting and enforcing their worth, is to be added that indefinable element or force of character which we call personality. In the president are to be found all the great elements of this precious, comprehensive power. In him, also, is to be realized the reconciliation of the contradictories. He is to be, or to have, a personality. Yet this personality is not to be made too personal, too impressive, too significant. He is not to be awesome, yet he is to command deep and constant respect. He is to represent progressiveness. For the work of the president relates to the future. He is also to represent conservatism. For the president's present work springs out of a past, long, rich, and fruitful. His work is to be contemplative. For education represents thoughtfulness as a mood, and thinking as a method.

[123] Recollections and Letters of General Robert E. Lee. By his son, Captain Robert E. Lee. pp. 294-295.

He is also to be administrator and executive. For his service consists in laying plans for doing things, and in the doing of the things themselves. He is to incarnate a union of vision and of nearest details, of soberness and of wit, of culture and of sympathy with the common mass, of self-respect without self-conceit, of administrative economy without penuriousness or meanness, of liberality without profuseness. He, this ideal president, is to be possessed of a certain noble modernness, yet he is not to be devoted to the temporary, as if it were eternal. David Starr Jordan says that the chief function of a college president is to take initiative and to give color and personality to an institution. To take initiative is indeed most important, and to give color and personality is also important. But he, the president, is to do and to be more than the giving of color and of personality. President L. Clark Seelye said, at the inauguration of his son-in-law, Rhees, as President of the University of Rochester:

"What he is will determine more than any legislative enactment what his authority will be. The greatest limitations to his power are in himself. To maintain and increase his sway, it is of supreme importance that he be able to repeat sincerely the Master's words, 'Ye call me Master and Lord, and ye say well, for so I am, but I am among you as one that serveth.' His authority will be proportional to the faithfulness and efficiency of his service. Opposition, harsh and unjust criticism, he will undoubt-

edly meet; the opposition he can most triumphantly overcome, and the criticism he can most conclusively answer, by assiduously developing in himself the best traits of mind and heart. Adding to the strength and courage of his convictions that charity which is not easily puffed up, he will learn how to accommodate himself to others, how to bear with them, how to win their confidence and to secure their friendly coöperation. A man thus disposed grows more powerful with his years. His word has the forceful momentum of his achievements and established character. Anderson at Rochester, Hopkins at Williams, Wayland at Brown, Woolsey at Yale, show how the president of a college, by magnanimity, by wisdom, by unselfish ministry, can win an authority more extensive than legislators could ever grant to their executive officer, more absolute than the most ambitious autocrat could ever attain. Men like these give to colleges their most permanent and extensive influence."[124]

The president is ever to be able to call out the best in others, as were presidents so diverse as Alice Freeman Palmer and Robert E. Lee, without exhausting his own forces. In character and power, he is ever to deserve the ephithet massive, or, if one please, stately, as are many ablest scholars. But, while thus recognized, he is not to lay himself open to the charge of heaviness. He is to be humble, but not self-

[124] Limitations of the Power of the College President. By L. Clark Seelye. Educational Review. Vol. XX. December, 1900. p. 449.

distrustful. He is to have tact without subtleness, and tenacity of purpose without stubbornness. He is to be versatile without instability, tolerant without indifference, sincere without hardness, reserved without coldness, optimistic without being visionary, cultured without being overrefined, to possess practical aptitudes with a firm grip on practice and theory, to have an instinct for liberty for all without license for any, to be earnest and intense without irritability, to be diligent with playfulness, to be idealistic without forgetting the nearest and most common duty, to possess a certain intellectual detachment which is consistent with devotion to, and understanding of, conditions, to have courage without arrogant boldness, caution without cowardice, to be apt for cooperation, yet able to hold his own purposes clear and firm, to have the virtue of concentration and yet to be broad in thought and in thinking. He is, as I have said, to reconcile the contradictories.

### 15. Religion

In this more personal survey, I now come to the consideration of, in certain respects, the most important of the elements of the president. It is also, I may add, the most difficult to present. It is the matter of his religious character. At once, however, let me say that the president should be a religious man. Of course, one has the right to say that the remark is as obvious as any remark which could be made. For the connotation of the epithet is determinative.

By a religious character, negatively, one does not mean that the president shall be a member of a church, nor, much more, that he shall be an ordained minister. He may not hold even a sympathetic relation as an adherent to any church, though probably he will. One does, however, positively, mean that, in an exterior sense, he shall have respect for the church as an historic institution, and that, also, he shall have regard for the origins of the church. The first day of the week shall not be to him as other days, but shall be held as a holy day. The Book of the church shall not be regarded quite as other books, but as a scripture more sacred than other great literatures. If he interpret the principles of the church as prejudices, he shall yet have respect to them as prejudices. Yet such exterior relations, though having value, are of slight worth compared to personal elements. Directly and comprehensively, it may be said that the president should have respect to the great commandments of Christ, first, of loving God supremely, and second, of loving his neighbor as himself. His interpretation of these two commandments might result in, or arise from, the beatitudes of Christ's Sermon on the Mount.[125] His whole interpretation, indeed, is

[125] President Ernest De Witt Burton, writing on "Religion and Education," has said:

"Jesus is the world's greatest thinker in the field of religion, and therefore the college which in every field seeks to get the best from the past and make the best use of it must take Jesus into account and cannot do better than to accept his spirit and follow his method. . . . In religion

to be theistic. That interpretation may represent a God whom he worships as a person, or a god with whom he communes as a beautiful presence and atmosphere. At least, he will have, as John Stuart Mill declares he himself had, an "unbounded reverence" for Christ.[126] At least, he incarnates the visions which Wordsworth's "Intimations" suggest. He may say, with Viscount Haldane, "There is no reason for assuming any external boundary between God and man."[127] At the least, however, in point of intellectual interpretation, he will believe in a power which is Goodness and which makes for Righteousness. This power he may interpret in terms of Kant or of

he was supreme. . . . The content of his thinking, the example of his character—these are invaluable inheritances. For all the centuries have gone on to prove not only that he had a right way of thinking, but that he reached right conclusions, and realized an ideal of character than which we can think of no better. His estimate of human values, his conception of God, his ideal of character as exemplified in himself have never been outlived or left behind. . . . Jesus, not only as the founder of our religion and the object of our reverence, but as the great exemplar of the best type of thinking that the world has yet discovered the best expounder of the fundamentals of religion, the best ideal of character, is entitled to recognition and leadership in all our colleges."—The Divinity Student. Vol. I, November 15, 1924. No. 4. pp. 92-93.

[126] The Letters of John Stuart Mill. Edited by Hugh S. R. Elliot. Vol. I. p. 93.

[127] The Philosophy of Humanism. By Viscount Haldane. p. 21.

Schleiermacher, of Fichte, or of Hegel. But to him this Power, this Absolute, is to be his God. Such a belief stands for devoutness and for devotion. In respect to conscious and ethical choice, his religion stands for the Kantian imperative. It spells "I ought." And in regard to moral choice, religion means to him allegiance to the right as embodied in the fitness of things, or in the principles of great human and humane movements. At the least, the religion of the president is to represent and to embody a real and vital relation to Ultimate Being. This relation, dimly conceived, or unknown, qualifies and quickens his own being. It represents, as I have said, Christ's two commandments. This relation, as a minimum of religious belief, belongs to most presidents; as a maximum to few. Such a relation gives to the president qualities and elements of inexpressible worth in meeting crises and in doing the common work of the common day. The sun of his life must have its rising and its zenith in other worlds, if he is to live his life best in this world. The most important financial journal in the United States is accustomed to declare, through its editorial utterance, that the permanent prosperity of business depends upon the belief of business men in the doctrine of immortality. Such teaching may be transferred to the academic sphere. If, in the financial relation, such a belief is necessary for best results, the inference is inevitable that, for the richest achievement, the

college president should be a religious man, possessing, at the very least, the type of belief which I have tried to sketch.

All these characteristics, which are more or less personal, hold intimate relationships to the president as an administrator or executive. His personality helps to constitute his presidency, and his presidency enriches his personality. The expression of personality is sometimes called atmosphere. Happy that president, and happy his college, who creates an unconscious influence making for an atmosphere of good fellowship. The result is more precious than many elements which can be measured and weighed. Of himself, Mark Pattison says: "In dealing with the students I soon became aware that I was the possessor of a magnetic influence, which soon, not perhaps at this early date, gave me a moral ascendency in the college, to which at last everybody, the Rector even, the students, the very servants, even at last Kay himself, succumbed." [128] Of the atmosphere of personality, in its bad sense, Pattison writes of one of his colleagues, saying:

"Everything in him was changed but his temper. He was more irritable than ever. He could not endure the smallest opposition to his new opinions, and could not control the expression of his irritation even in public debate. This provoked irritation on the other and weaker side. I never remember any single academic of my time against whom there existed such

[128] Memoirs. By Mark Pattison. p. 221.

a bitter feeling as was felt toward Conington by the Liberals at that date." [129]

As one considers the list of presidents who are thus endowed with unconscious influence or atmosphere, certain names spring to the memory. Among them are Northrop of Minnesota, the apostle of good feeling, Benjamin Andrews, the incarnation of virile, forth-putting manliness, Robert E. Lee, as great a gentleman in the presidency as he was a strategist in campaigns, and Tucker, loved and honored by all for his broad vision, high idealism and rich character.

Of the president as a personality I have so far written. Yet, in thus trying to interpret him, I have found myself considering him as an officer also. I now turn more specifically to write of him as an officer. But, in this aspect, I shall inevitably be obliged also to consider him as a person. The two relations are, of course, unavoidably and inextricably interwoven.

Of the president as an administrator, many and diverse are the interpretations to be made, but they can be embraced under and unified in a few principles. For as a few basic tones form all the harmonies and melodies of music, so a few principles constitute the character of the president as an administrator or executive.

### 16. Organizing Power

In a comprehensive interpretation, the president

[129] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

should have the power of social and educational organization. Possibly for organization should be substituted, or made to stand along with it, the word reorganization. This spirit, organizing and reorganizing, usually moves under ordinary academic conditions, and sometimes under extraordinary. Unique conditions prevailed in the last half of the fifth decade of the last century in Oxford. They were likewise vigorous in the last half of the seventh decade of the last century in America. Mark Pattison says: "A restless fever of change had spread through the colleges—the wonder-working phrase, University reform, had been uttered, and that in the House of Commons. The sounds seemed to breathe new life into us. We against reform! Why, it was the very thing we had been so long sighing for; we were ready to reform a great deal—everything—only show us how to set about it and give us the necessary powers." [130]

Organization represents a union of many elements; but in particular it represents the power standing for unity, for strengthening, for projecting into use the several elements that constitute a college or a university. It is distinguished from, though it uses, the power of thought and of reflection. It is distinct from, though it uses, the power of emotion. It is distinct from, though it uses, the power of conscience. It is will applied, will supported by understanding, warmed by feeling, quickened by ethical principle. It is will applied to the conditions and forces which are

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

to be organized. Certain presidents (would they were numerous!) seem to possess this consummate manifold power unto genius. Most possess it in a moderate degree, and few in a degree slight. The greater the possession, in equality, or even in inequality, to other gifts, the richer the achievement. McCosh, having this fundamental element, did a great work in the reorganization of Princeton, a work of which he has himself written in honorable pride:

"I came at an opportune time. I owe any success I have had to this circumstance more than to any other. The war, so disastrous and yet so glorious, was over. Princeton College had suffered,—not, however, in honor,—but she had numerous friends, and nobly did they gather round her, and they said, as it were, to me, in language loud enough for me to hear, 'Do you advance and we will support you.' In those days I was like the hound in the leash ready to start, and they encouraged me with their shouts as I sprang forth into the hunt.

"When called to this place, I was a professor in the youngest of the universities set up by Great Britain; I had helped somewhat to form it, and in doing so had to study the European systems of college education. But I announced: 'I have no design, avowed or secret, to revolutionize your American colleges, or reconstruct them after a European model. I have seen enough of the American colleges to become convinced that they are not rashly to be meddled with. They are the spontaneous growth of your position and

intelligence; they are associated with your history, and have become adjusted to your wants, and whatever improvements they admit of must be built on the old foundation.'

"I became heir at once to a rich inheritance handed down by a long line of presidential ancestors, in Dickinson, Burr, Edwards, Davis, Finley, Witherspoon, Stanhope Smith, Ashbel Green, Carnahan, and Maclean. It was my privilege to reap what others had sown; I was awed, and yet encouraged, by the circumstance that I had to follow such intellectual giants as Edwards and Witherspoon. My immediate predecessor was John Maclean, 'the well beloved,' who watched over the young men so carefully, and never rebuked a student without making him a friend. But I did not allow myself to fall into the weakness of trying to do over again what my predecessors had done, and done so well. My aim has been to advance with the times, and to do a work in my day such as they did in theirs. My heart has all along been in my work, which I commenced immediately after my inauguration." [181]

This long extract well voices, in the pride of humility, the work which James McCosh did in the renaissance of Princeton College and for the foundation of Princeton University.

In the organization or reorganization of his college, the president is, consciously or unconsciously, quick-

[181] The Life of James McCosh. Edited by William Milligan Sloane. pp. 191-192.

ened and guided by the ideal he holds for the college. His ideal stands midway between his idea for the college and the idealism which fills, or surrounds, him as an atmosphere. His ideal may take on either of two types. It may be either absolute or relative. The absolute idealist has little or no regard for the times, space, and conditions for gaining his purposes. The relative idealist has a very particular regard for the conditions for realizing his aims. The one has no sense of relations, the other, a very distinct sense. The one is typed by Plato, and the other by Aristotle, one by Kant or Hegel, and the other by James. The exterior peril of the one is obstructiveness, and of the other, narrowness and smallness. The idealist who is not devoted to the application of his ideals becomes the balloonist. He is lost and is useless. The idealist who is only a pragmatist falls into, and stays in, the valleys of his little conceptions. He also is lost and is useless. The great president is a practical or pragmatic idealist. Andrew D. White, dealing with the law makers at Albany in the local founding of Cornell, Angell, in enlarging and strengthening the university at Ann Arbor, Gilman, in calling great researchers and teachers to Baltimore, Harper, in interesting the community and individuals in the University of Chicago,—each united the far-off vision of a completed foundation with the immediate details of plan and of construction, material and human.

The content of the ideal, moreover, may likewise take on two forms. The content may relate largely

to the university as an ultimate end in itself, or as a relative end which, in turn, becomes a means. Certain presidents seem to hold their university as in itself an ultimate purpose. A president has, within a few hours of this writing, said to me, that he cared only for his school. What made for its welfare was well; what interfered with that welfare was bad. To others the institution represents a method for reaching or for fulfilling an ideal,—an ideal still more remote and higher, namely, the intellectual and other enrichment of humanity. Of course, to the larger mind, the great human purpose dominates the institutional one.

The academic systems, indeed, under which presidents serve differ. Some of these systems are bad; many of them are good; a few are excellent. The best of them can be made, and will be made, yet better. They are constantly subject to change. The movement toward the unity of the three great parts, or parties,—the trustees, the faculty, and the graduates,—is now peculiarly strong, and becoming yet stronger. The election of graduates, of and by their own number, to the board of trustees is progressing and is working well. It represents a trend fitting to the increasing responsibilities which official boards are laying on the alumni for securing funds. The recent campaigns for endowment have been largely conducted by graduates. Such a conclusion is both the cause and the result of an increasing and more influential membership of graduates in the official boards.

The movement for the inclusion of members of the teaching staff in the board of trust is also progressing. The movement is not, however, meeting with increasing approbation. It promotes personal and administrative sympathies, but it is, as I have already intimated, at times subject to embarrassment arising from the discussion of somewhat personal academic questions. The system of government which a president finds prevailing at the time of his induction into office is the one under which, for the time at least, he should be content to labor. Any change which he believes would work for improvement, he should promote only after he has proved his own discretion.

In his administration, the president may find that the university has a board small in numbers, as usually obtains in the state universities, or a board large in numbers, as frequently obtains in denominational colleges. He may find that there are two boards besides the faculty, such as obtain in a few colleges. He may find that the methods of instituting the boards differ, the membership being in one as permanent as are the terms of the members of the United States Supreme Court. Or he may find that members are elected for a term of years only. But he will work, for the time at least, in harmony with the method which he finds prevailing. Each of these methods possesses certain advantages and is subject to certain disadvantages. The small board is prone to take up executive functions, and so to inter-

fere unduly with the president's. Yet, the small board makes for efficiency. The large board is prone to lay too great responsibilities on the president and to give him, consequently, too absolute control. Two boards, coöperating, may give wisdom and safety, but are liable to the charge of undue conservatism and are prone to include members who are aloof from educational movements. Aloofness in the membership is in peril of promoting academic indifference and stagnation. Membership on such terms is often interpreted as an honor, and not as an opportunity for service. Election of members for a term of years—five or ten is the normal length,—with the right of reëlection, on the whole, is the best method. It joins together the elements of a conservative policy with the opportunity of usefulness. But, at all events, and under all conditions, the unitary system of all boards gives emotional sympathy without unduly lessening individual responsibilities, and without interfering with directness in service.

### 17. Autocracy

Among the more fundamental of all the principles of the college president is the autocratic or democratic element in his own character. As a consequence, the relation of the personal element to his administration is primary. The chief question is whether the president is normally and naturally autocratic, or whether he is a leader in a democratic, or a republican, or an oligarchic, form of academic government. It is com-

monly believed that the normal president is, and delights in being, an absolute monarch. This belief, in certain cases, is a true interpretation. A dear friend and neighbor of mine is of this type. He has complete power in the appointment or dismissal of teachers, and in the composition of the curriculum. Such power is, of course, conferred upon him by the board of trustees. That he uses his power well illustrates the fact that a bad system administered by a good man may bring forth good results. Of course, a good system also may be so administered as to bring forth evil results. Of course, moreover, aside from his character, or inclination, the president is a creature of a board of trustees. This board may, or may not, require him to exercise an autocratic control. There is, be it at once acknowledged, the president who is an essential tyrant. His tyranny may be either ruthless or benevolent, but he can be, and he is, a despot. This type is not frequent, and is far less frequent to-day than ever before, and, be it added, is far less common than is usually supposed. He—the ruthless despot—belongs to the class of the ungentlemanly; the consideration of him, therefore, may be set aside. The benevolent despot is less unworthy, but in the trend of affairs, as touching him, both the public and the academic opinion is thoroughly against. There is the president who is an autocrat, but who is also a consulting autocrat. He appoints no professor or instructor without conferring with the members of that department of study in which the

proposed appointee is to serve. He puts into force no new scholastic or administrative method without first taking counsel of those who are most immediately concerned with its application. He builds no new building, or reconstructs no old one, without first learning the judgment and preference of those who are to use the building. Of course, such methods of securing light for leading would seem to be inevitable. Yet there is the president who does not avail himself of such opportunities. There is the president who seems to regard his work as individualistic, without relationships. Illustrations of such singleness of aim and method are not lacking. Among the earlier and more outstanding examples is that provided by Richard Bentley. In the year 1700, and in the thirty-eighth year of his life,—a year of one's life not unique for assuming college presidencies,—Bentley became master of Trinity College, Cambridge. A part of the succeeding term of his service has been fittingly called his "Thirty Years' War." A great classical scholar, he lacked the scholar's breadth of vision. His mood was domineering, his contempt for his associates insulting, his disregard of rules and regulations constant and virulent, his means and methods for securing his purposes, even if good,—as they frequently were,—unscrupulous. He survived, however, all contentions, and proved a final victor in all suits for eviction. Till the year of his death, he remained the masterful master of the most important college of the University of Cambridge.

Bentley's despotism has been followed, although infrequently, by other and similar tyrannies.[132]

[132] "The theory of the presidency is definitely stated in a series of statutes defining the powers and duties of the president that were drawn up a few years ago when a president was sought for an important university. They were formulated by the trustees after consultation with the leading candidate for the position, and they are given in full as being probably the most explicit statement as yet made concerning the office.

" 'First. The president shall be ex-officio a member of each faculty, and it shall be his right and duty to preside at every meeting thereof.

" 'Second. The president shall have the power of nominating the dean of each faculty, subject to the approval of the board of trustees.

" 'Third. The president shall have the right to attend all meetings of the board and to address the board upon all subjects connected with the university. He shall be ex-officio a member of all standing committees of the board.

" 'Fourth. The president shall have the exclusive right to transmit all communications from each faculty and from each member thereof, to the board.

" 'Fifth. The president shall have the right to recommend to the board the vacation of professorships and other positions in all departments.

" 'Sixth. The president shall have the exclusive right to nominate professors in all departments except in so far as this may be inconsistent with the contracts under which certain of the departments are now conducted.

" 'Seventh. The president shall have ultimate authority in all matters of discipline.

" 'Eighth. The president shall have the right to advise the board in all matters of expenditure.

" 'Ninth. The president shall have control of all employees engaged in the preservation and maintenance of the buildings of all departments of the university, and he shall be the chief custodian of such buildings.'

The case of President Ayers, of the University of Cincinnati, is perhaps the most notorious:

"It is not often that a theoretical discussion finds so apt an illustration as is provided . . . by the

"At another great university a popular professor of another institution was offered the presidency, but he 'delayed his acceptance until he had come to a clear understanding with the regents as to their future relations. He said with much frankness that one great disadvantage of the University of ———— had always been the disposition of the regents to meddle in the internal management, especially in personal matters, such as appointments, promotions, and salaries; and he received assurance that the initiative in these matters should rest with himself.'

"At a third great institution, where the power of control came to be vested in a single person, it was announced that the trustee had paid 'a high compliment to President ———— by giving him absolute power over the management of the educational affairs of the university.'

"At a fourth institution the candidate selected by the board of trustees dictated his own terms in accepting the office of the president of a college and it was announced that 'the board of trustees has accepted the principles proposed by ———— and all direction of the faculty will proceed from him.'

"At another time a university president took summary action in regard to several members of the faculty, and when 'the persons concerned' asked the reason for the action they received the reply from the president, 'I have no reasons to give. It is my pleasure.'

"These illustrations could be multiplied almost indefinitely. They seem to furnish some ground for the observation of a college professor that 'the college presidency is a despotism untempered by assassination.'"—The Next College President. By A Near-Professor. The Popular Science Monthly. Vol. LXXXIII, September, 1913, pp. 273-274.

affairs of the University of Cincinnati. Last summer [1899] the University of Cincinnati, having long been without a president, obtained one from a neighboring State, and a few months later this new incumbent of the position startled the community by an arbitrary demand for the resignation of nearly all the members of the faculty. The Directors of the University stood behind the executive in this action, although it was taken in defiance of the by-laws and before the new executive could have made any real acquaintance with the work of his associates. The men thus summarily dismissed included several scholars of long service and high distinction, whose work had been uniformly commended for many years in the annual reports of the Directors. This high-handed proceeding aroused public indignation to such an extent that great numbers of the most respected citizens rallied to the defense of the faculty, and sought to obtain, if not reversal of the action, at least a definite statement of the grounds upon which it was taken. The Citizens' Committee was composed of men of such standing that its protest was entitled to the most respectful consideration. This consideration it can hardly be said to have obtained, and its efforts have resulted neither in the restoration of the instructors dismissed, nor even in any defense of the act which is deserving of serious consideration." The report declared:

"It has been clearly established by incontrovertible testimony that these reputable citizens, learned men,

competent professors, courteous gentlemen, and life-long promoters of the educational interests of our city were, without previous notice, roughly summoned by the janitor of the building to repair at once to the President's private office, where, in the presence of a stenographer to record what was said and in the absence of other witnesses to the interview, an imperious demand was made that they at once attach their signatures to already prepared resignations. . . . When the surprised and mortified victims pleaded for a little time in which to consider the matter, they were promptly informed that unless the prepared resignations were signed, sealed, and delivered before five P. M. on the following day, they would be disgraced by a summary and unconditional dismissal, which he stated he had been empowered to enforce. . . . Finally when such threats failed to terrify into subservient submission and abject surrender, his threats were turned to pleadings and promises that if they would sign and preserve absolute secrecy in regard to the whole matter, he would give them the aid of his commendation and powerful influence in obtaining appointments elsewhere—an offer whose ethical nature will scarcely bear investigation. . . . This by a man who has never had a meeting of his faculty for the purpose of considering or discussing conditions, outlining his policy, or in any shape or form, indicating a desire for changes of any character or kind; a man who has never visited any of the class rooms, heard a single recitation, or taken any

means whatever toward making himself acquainted with the workings of the university.

"These statements constitute a sufficiently scathing denunciation of a proceeding which must be viewed with apprehension by all who are concerned with the best interests of the higher education. Such star-chamber methods are absolutely indefensible, and should excite widespread indignation. 'Under the absolute despotism of the present administration,' says one of the professors whose resignations were demanded, 'the faculty has ceased to be a free deliberative body, and its rightful prerogatives have been disregarded in respect to the great university questions.' That such conditions as these should be possible in any American university offers an alarming indication of the tendency to depart from those principles of university management which are essential to the well-being of every institution of learning. The testimony of Professor P. V. N. Myers, who was not dismissed, but who promptly added his own resignation to those which had been forced from his colleagues, deserves also to be given. The scholarship and the character of Professor Myers need no defense, and his words carry with them much weight. He says:

" 'As a believer in the eternal justice of God, and as a teacher of the supremacy of the law of righteousness in human life and history, I cannot consent to work with President Ayers, as he has asked me to do, in carrying on the future work of the University,

since by so doing, I should be giving approval to the professional assassination—I cannot use a less accusing word—by a comparative stranger, of my colleagues of many years, some of whom I have come to know intimately, and through such knowledge have acquired the right to declare that in their persons has been violated every principle of humanity and justice. . . . For me to remain as a teacher in the University under the administration so unhappily inaugurated would be to undo the work of my past life, and to impart a false note to all my instructions I have ever held up before the young men and young women to whom I have had the privilege and honor to stand in the relation of teacher, friend, and guide, as the loftiest ideal of conduct, unswerving fidelity to conscience and the dictates of duty. I have told them never to follow expediency, but ever fearlessly to follow close after right and justice, regardless of consequences. If I, myself, as I now stand at the parting of the ways, should falter and fail to act in accordance with my own teachings, should hesitate, because of the pain and sacrifice that the act involves, to set my feet in the path which is plainly the path of honor and of duty, how could I ever again tell the young of the regnancy of conscience, of the majesty of the eternal laws of righteousness, of the divineness and inviolability of justice, save in words that would ring hollow as sounding brass?' No technical rejoinder, no amount of sophistical reasoning, can avail against the force of this sincere and digni-

fied utterance, supported, as it is, by the respected personality of its distinguished writer.'' [133]

Instances of despotism, hardly less severe, even if less notorious than Ayers' or Bentley's, do yet disfigure the academic history of each year. They deserve, and usually receive, general and deepest condemnation. They are antagonistic to the fine judgments and noble spirit of humanity, as well as contradictory to the best civil and academic government. Even if they are infrequent, their infrequency offers no ground for their justification.

The causes of such a development, even if its manifestations be only occasional, in a democratic republic, and especially in an academic democracy or republic, are not far to seek. First, and foremost, is the disposition of certain strong men to be commanding and masterful. Such tyranny is perhaps one of the natural results of the possession of power. A second reason is the legacy of the common school to the college of the authority, sometimes amounting to tyranny, of the head of that system. A third reason is found in the division of interests of the teacher and of the administrator. The fourth reason lies in the competition existing between colleges which seems to demand special directness and forcefulness, qualities that lead to a certain type of despotism, as is manifest in the commonwealth as well as in the university. The condition seems to be somewhat akin to the movement for

[133] Theory and Practice. Editorial, The Dial. Vol. XXVIII, June 1, 1900. pp. 426-427.

direct political action. A fifth cause is found in the expansions of the college following the Civil War, a period and a condition which seemed to demand, or at least to allow, a certain executive commandingness, previously unknown. General Lee became president of what is now Washington and Lee University, and General Chamberlain of Bowdoin. Under the power of such causes, certain college presidents have not answered in themselves the prayer of Marcus Aurelius, that he might beware of becoming Cæsarized!

A not uncommon opinion of the nature of the work and the character of the president is expressed, and characteristically, by Professor Cattell in saying:

"The trouble in the case of the university president is that he is not a leader, but a boss. He is selected by and is responsible to a body practically outside the university, which in the private corporations is responsible to nobody. In our political organization, the mayor, governor or president has great power, too great in my opinion, if only because it demoralizes the legislature; but they are responsible to the people who elect them. I object even more to the irresponsibility of the university president than to his excessive powers. The demoralization that the president works in the university is not limited to his own office; it has given us the department-store system, the existing exhibit of sub-bosses—deans, heads of departments, presidential committees, professors appointed by, with salaries determined by,

and on occasion dismissed by, the president, all subject to him and dependent on his favor."[134]

This type of president is not unique. The type is suffered by some, though few, governing bodies by reason of the forcefulness of the incumbent. Of course, moreover, autocracies are sometimes characterized by efficiency and by the excellence of the results gained. For the college despot who is wise is not unknown in academic annals.

The arguments against autocracy have been well stated by two outstanding presidents of the former generation. President Eliot has said:

"The president of a university should never exercise an autocratic or one-man power. He should be often an inventing and animating force, and often a leader; but not a ruler or autocrat. His success will be due more to powers of exposition and persuasion combined with persistent industry, than to any force of will or habit of command. Indeed, one-man power is always objectionable in a university, whether lodged in president, secretary of the trustees, dean, or head of department."[135]

President Seelye, of Smith, also has said:

"Autocracy, however, is a hazardous expedient, and is likely to prove ultimately as pernicious in a college as it is in a state. It induces too great reliance upon the distinctive characteristics of a despot, and too little upon those of a gentleman. One-

[134] University Control. By J. McKeen Cattell. p. 32.
[135] University Administration, p. 238.

man power is apt to enfeeble or to alienate those who are subject to it. . . . Successful autocrats are few, and however long their term of service, it is short compared with the life of an institution. If they leave as an inheritance a spirit which has suppressed free inquiry, and which has made it difficult to secure and retain teachers of strong personality, the loss will probably be greater than any apparent gain which may have come through the rapid achievements of a Napoleonic policy." [136]

Yet, on the other hand, the president, who is willing so far to surrender his functions as to become the servant or the pet of the board of trustees, or of the faculty, bodies to whom he does, in the nature of things, bear the relation of headship or of leadership, is likewise unworthy. If the autocratic president is feared, the vassal president is despised. The vassal president usually lacks educational vision, he is blind, he also lacks an educational policy, he has neither chart nor compass. His purposes are either narrow or low, or wholly lacking. His will is an incarnated weakness. His experiences are limited. His character is innocent of any sense of appealingness. The mood of his associates toward him is one of pity. He belongs to the order of the agreeable. Such a vassal does occasionally come into office, and he remains in office by reason of the unwillingness of official boards to hurt his soft heart. They forget, or at least they are prone to forget, the injury which the college suf-

[136] University Control, p. 34. By J. McKeen Cattell.

fers, both for the present and for the future. "The danger of our present system of university control is that it tempts a man to play for his own hand and selects for academic work men lacking in character, individuality and genius."[137]

The president, as an administrator, as I have before intimated in interpreting him as a personality, should unite many characters, or embody many characteristics, some of which seem to be contradictory. He should not be a legislator, yet he should be legislative, proposing policies and methods for debates, the rejection of which should not unduly depress, nor their adoption unduly elate. He should also exercise the judicial function. He may not, indeed should not, constitute the supreme court, but of that court he should be a member, and perhaps its chief justice. To his opinions, weight should be given, not only because of their intrinsic worthiness, but also because they are the opinions of the president. He is to be an executive. He is to carry out the will of the legislative body, both professorial and trustee, executing the decisions of the supreme court. He is, furthermore, to be an administrator. He is to take into view all the interests and functions of the college, both as historian and prophet as well as an immediate officer.

The university, be it added, is not a bank, or a steel company, or a harvester corporation. The university is concerned with the making of men and with the search for truth. Manhood and truth are

[137] *Ibid.*, Footnote No. 2, p. 18.

the proper product. The financial corporation, the manufacturing corporation, deals with men and with truth as the process, and with dividends as the product. Of course, in a large and broad vision, the making of men is the purpose, as well as the privilege of the financial or the maufacturing corporation; but whatever may be the purpose or the process, both the college and the bank demand administrators who possess in themselves the equally great qualities of manhood and of efficiency.

In this adjusting relation, it is to the president's advantage to possess the knack and the tact of committing as much of his work as possible to other minds and wills and hands. Presidents, like most other administrators, differ fundamentally in respect to the transferring of their tasks. Some do all they can themselves. Some do the least they can themselves. They also differ in regard to the changes in their official services in the course of a long period. The length of a term is liable to result in the increase of the details of procedure which a president assumes. The comprehensive truth is that the president should give to others, his subordinates or his superiors, all the work which they are willing to accept. Much of his work can be done quite as well by others as by himself. The strength thus set free may be devoted to duties which cannot be delegated.

The transfer of duties from the president to associates should be made complete. It should also be accompanied with full confidence in the ability of

those to whom it is entrusted. One of the great elements in Mr. Lloyd George's service was his willingness to trust his subordinates in full confidence. He seldom or never interfered. The college president should be of a similar type. Against interference he needs to be on constant guard. Often the more faithful a college president is, the more prone is he to yield to the temptation of interference. One president is known to me who is guilty of constant nagging. For example, the glee club of his college cannot make a trip at the holidays without his inquisitiveness into all details and without his imposing suggestions which are easily interpreted as commands.

In this delegating, the president should retain at least two philosophic rights or practical duties: first, the request of an annual report from each teacher; and, second, the reading of an architect's plans. The first duty of receiving and of interpreting a teacher's statements regarding his service is of constant and serious value. The second is of occasional usefulness. The figures or the dots should mean more to him than to Randolph Churchill, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, as set forth in a well-known anecdote. Elevations and sketches should also have as distinct a meaning to him as picture-reading to a Chinese scholar.

Though the office of the American president is quite unlike the duties of an Oxford master, I do venture to take an instance of the failure to delegate work as found in the great Hawkins, provost at Oriel for

almost a half-century, from 1828 to 1874: "No detail seemed to escape him. 'He had *a genius* for such minute accuracy of detail. . . . If, in matters of business especially, there was a blot, he would be sure to hit it."[138] A fellow of Oriel writes also: "During the early days of his Provostship, he was apt to think he must prescribe to others what they must do *and think.*"[139] Of course, Hawkins was as unique in his meticulous care, as his term was unique in its length.

Such an extreme is, of course, as much to be avoided, as is the other extreme of the undue committing of great duties to associates. Yet, it is ever to be borne in mind that the transfer of either great duties, or small, does not free the president from laboriousness. He is simply to do all he can in the numerous and diverse ways open for and through his college.

One comprehensive form of this labor lies, as I have already pointed out, in devotion to students. An integral part of the relationship of the president to the students is represented by the various students' societies and clubs, associations into which students organize themselves. These societies are almost numberless, and of a variety quite as great as is the number. The fundamental organization is, of course, the class, an organization based upon the year of entrance and

[138] Lives of Twelve Good Men: Edward Hawkins. By John William Burgon. Vol. I, p. 436.

[139] *Ibid.*, p. 437.

the presumed year of graduation. Next to the class the most important is the organization of the whole body of students into what are usually known as students' associations, or students' councils, or students' government societies. These bodies are designed to regulate certain of the informal affairs that belong to the students' little world. In certain colleges they even take up so important a matter as proctoring, or guardianship of examinations. As a part of this whole system, too, the fraternities or sororities are formed. They represent, not only the uniting of undergraduates, but also the permanent membership of graduates in their chapter, and, through the chapter, or otherwise, in the whole college. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the dramatic clubs, the musical clubs, the athletic clubs, the walking clubs, the chess clubs, intimate the variety and the number.

The attitude of the president to all these societies of students is of serious significance. Negatively, this attitude should never be of opposition and seldom of destructive criticism. Positively, the attitude should be of interpretation, of the understanding of relations, of sympathy and of helpfulness, both direct and indirect. Bad elements in method and means and atmosphere are found, at times, in each of these organizations. Not a few of them are of neutral worth. Not a few of them are superfluous. But, in general, their elimination, their improvement, the re-

inforcement of their work, the enrichment of their influence, as a part of the academic foundation, are far more effectively gained by sympathy than by opposition, by interpretation than by remoteness, by close fellowship with the membership than by neutrality. The president's helpfulness, of course, must not be distinguished by meddlesomeness. One of the purposes of these organizations is to train members in proper doing through their own independence and initiative. But ever he is to hold himself in the mood of a discerning and wise father to these, his sons and his daughters, gathered together in these associations.

A far more fundamental part of the laboriousness of a president lies in the opportunity of thinking about the college or the university. The opportunity for reflection represents a fundamental duty. This opportunity is broken into by the calls to do things, calls frequent and calls insistent. It cannot often be said of an American college president, as it was said once of an Oxford master, that he was so much concerned with his own thoughts that he gave no attention to his duties. But these calls may be so heeded that a superior obligation, more weighty indeed than the sum of these calls, may be passed unrecognized. There is a legend—of course it is a legend, although Cicero in two places refers to it—that Democritus put his eyes out that he might have the better opportunity to think. The humorist might say that the president has no need to put his eyes out, for his

sight is never good. But his duty, as an executive, of thinking is more abounding than is the duty of the philosopher. Southey was once telling a Quaker how he spent his happy days. He explained to her that while he was shaving of the morning, he studied the Portuguese grammar, that, between shaving and breakfast, he read Spanish for an hour, that, after breakfast, he studied more, or read much, until dinner. He told her, in fact, that his whole time was spent in studying, reading, writing, sleeping, talking, eating, exercising. Her reply was, "And friend, when dost thee think?" The question is pertinent to every college president. He is so engaged in doing things that he has no chance to reflect. Alas! his doing soon ceases, or is made fundamentally unworthy, by reason of the lack of reflection.

The president is that member of the official staff who is best qualified to be the intellectual supervisor or overseer, able to understand the relation of department to department, of working force to work, of revenue to expense, of personality to personality. He is the only one normally called to consider the duty of the college to the people, or of the people to the college. He is the prophet who should demand opportunities for silent meditation for himself, rather than the spokesman for and in minor conditions. The president is named the administrator or executive. It would be wise for us also to recognize him as the thinker. It would be well for him himself occasionally to recall one of Rodin's most famous sculptures.

Of course, such thinking is to recognize all the categories. It is to be sane, without being indifferent, large without being empty, progressive without being radical, deep without being obscure or narrow. It is to be, and may be, absorbing, too absorbing. When the first president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the great Rogers, fell ill, the attending physician reported that his disease was "Institute on the mind." Of course, thinking and thoughtfulness are to be colored by the sense of moral obligations. This sense may become, in certain presidents, so keen as to approach irritability. Such was the conscience of Hawkins: "The very key-note of all his actions,—the one sufficient clue to whatever he said or did,—was his high *conscientiousness.* Beyond everything he was solicitous to be truthful,—exact,—impartial,—just."[140] From such reflection, the gift of interpretation normally springs. The president is to be an interpreter. No small share of his work lies in explaining conditions to his official boards and to individual associates. For this purpose, he is to see clearly, to distinguish proportionally, to state what he sees with orderliness, with happiness to those who hear, and with persuasiveness to those who are called to make decisions. After thirty-nine years of service, President Eliot quoted, in a public address, a paragraph which is to be found in his inaugural:

"The President should be able to discern the practical essence of complicated and long-drawn dis-

[140] *Ibid.*, p. 431.

cussions. He must often pick out that promising part of theory which ought to be tested by experiment, and must decide how many of things desirable are also attainable, and what one of many projects is ripest for execution. He must watch and look before: watch, to seize opportunities to get money, to secure eminent teachers and scholars, and to influence public opinion toward the advancement of learning; and look before, to anticipate the due effect on the university of the fluctuations of public opinion on educational problems, of the progress of the institutions which feed the University, of the changing conditions of the professions which the University supplies, of the rise of new professions, of the gradual alteration of social and religious habits in the community. The University must accommodate itself promptly to significant changes in the character of the people for whom it exists. The institutions of higher education in any nation are always a faithful mirror in which are sharply reflected the national history and character. In this mobile nation the action and reaction between the University and society at large are more sensitive and rapid than in stiffer communities. The President, therefore, must not need to see a house built before he can comprehend the plan of it. He can profit by a wide intercourse with all sorts of men, and by every real discussion on education, legislation, and sociology."[141]

[141] University Administration. By Charles W. Eliot. pp. 239-241.

In all his reflection and leadership, the president is ever to be possessed of a proper theory of the nature of the higher education. This understanding belongs to the pre-college and to the post-college relation, as well as to the college term. Each part is vitally connected with every other part. If the president lack a just understanding of the nature of education, his administration will be intellectually dissolute, emotionally irritating, and, in point of service, ineffective. He will be the constant cause of unhappiness to himself and to his colleagues. It is better for him to have an incorrect theory of education than to have none at all. For an incorrect theory, if held, leads to discussion, and discussion helps on to correctness of understanding. The lack of a chart impels to the drifting of the college ship, and drifting creates all manner of academic evils. The great presidents of Brown, of Johns Hopkins, of Harvard, of Columbia, were possessed by, and presented, theories of education. Barnard's interpretations, for instance, of the nature of education, of college government, of graduate instruction, and of university organization, are of great worth. His experience as the head of three universities, and his uniting the breadth and the strength of the clergyman and of the scientist gave to his understandings a unique worth. Wayland's early presentation of the elective system of studies had finally great and general weight. Whether one believes or disbelieves in theories thus held, it is plain

that the holding of them has resulted in the shedding of much light on educational questions.

### 18. Salary

In the consideration of the office, one should not neglect the matter of salary. It is a very simple matter, but it is also weighty. Of course, the wise president gives no special heed to this personal matter, fundamental as it is, or may be, in relation to his own welfare. For a board of trustees may usually be trusted to arrange for a proper support as indicated in a sufficient stipend. In the year 1864, Raymond, the first president of Vassar, wrote to Matthew Vassar:

"Having served the cause of public education to the best of my poor ability for now nearly thirty years (fourteen in the faculty of Hamilton, five at Rochester and nine in my present position), I have it to say that never in a single instance until now have I sought, directly or indirectly, to make terms for myself, never objected to the compensation offered me, never asked for a dollar's advance, and—never made the two ends of a year meet. During this entire period I have been laboring for the benefit of large and wealthy communities (for the Baptists of the Empire State, for the garden region of western New York, and for Brooklyn, the 'third city of the Union'); my labors have been accepted with an overgenerous praise, and paid for at the usual market-

price of such commodities, and yet I have done it at a constant pecuniary sacrifice to myself, and have been dependent upon extra-professional labors to eke out a bare support for my family."[142]

The serious point, however, for my present purpose relates to the proportion which the salary of the president bears to the salary of his professorial associates. In general, this salary should be, I believe, about double the typical salary of the regular teacher of permanent tenure. This judgment is based on: first, the president's term covers the whole year, and not thirty-six weeks; second, he has many incidental expenses, such as entertainment and traveling. Certain colleges make a special appropriation for such charges, but I am obliged to say that most do not. I know of one president who, in a single year, spent sixteen hundred dollars from his own purse for traveling. At the present time, a tendency prevails to pay a far larger salary to the president than the stipends of his colleagues would warrant. Certain, not many, presidents resist the movement, and wisely. One president was asked to accept a salary of twenty thousand dollars. When he learned that the ordinary professorial salary was less than four thousand dollars, he declined election. Another candidate was found who accepted. A large stipend for the president links him with the executive of industrial plants, removing him from the academic

[142] Life and Letters of John Howard Raymond. pp. 509-510.

brotherhood. The chief good element, however, in a large executive stipend is the hope that the salaries of the teachers may be properly raised toward their proportional level. The bad element in such disproportion lies in removing the emphasis from the essential part of the college, the teaching staff, to the executive. The peril of the creation of a lack of sympathy between the members of the faculty and the president is not to be lightly passed over. The executive and the teacher should rejoice, or should suffer, as one.

This judgment regarding disproportional salaries, I hold, despite the increasing importance of the office of the president, despite the increasing variety and seriousness of the demands made upon the office, despite the increasing difficulty of finding proper men to fill the office, and despite the competition with industrial corporations which are also asking for efficient executives. For, the man fitted for a college presidency is not one to whom income has fundamental significance. It is to him only a condition or method, and never an end. For he belongs to a priesthood. The office is sacred. Its rewards are not pecuniary. Its comparisons are akin to the comparisons Adam Smith points out as belonging to "physics," "law," "poetry," and "philosophy." The pecuniary rewards of these professions and of the calling of the college president is unimportant because the human and humane recognition of the presidency is so rich.

The possession of wealth, moreover, either acquired

or inherited, is of doubtful value to the president. In the administration of an office, an income outside or beyond a salary is a convenience which may minister to the comfort of the home and to the efficiency of the office. But wealth, if it lead to large expenditure, may serve to erect a barrier between the members of a faculty and the president. At least, the faculty may easily feel that it does lessen sympathy and fellowship. But, of course, wealth or penury is of small importance in itself in comparison with the interpretation which its possessor, be he its victim or its master, gives to it. Wealth rather aided, than hurt the service of Low of Columbia. It also rather increases, than limits, the usefulness of the present presidents—the number is small—who are possessed of it.

The contrast between the present salary of the president and the salary of his predecessor of seventy-five years ago is marked. In many colleges that salary was only a thousand dollars, and this minimum, or maximum, too, was paid irregularly. Of it certain presidents gave back to the college, in leading a campaign for endowment, not less than a quarter.

For the better equipping of some one department, as of philosophy, of which the earlier president was usually the head, he may find it necessary to give of his income, be it ever so small. At once humorous and sad is the case of Mark Hopkins going up and down the towns of the Berkshires to get money to

buy a manikin for the use of his classes.[143] But it is to be said that the president of the earlier time was also a professor, a service which commanded its own stipend.

[143] "He early perceived the value of one of the illustrating manikins which had come into usefulness and renown in France. In 1841 one had been imported into this region, probably by Dr. Armsby, of the Albany Medical College, but for some reason was offered for sale. Its price was several hundred dollars. As the funds of the college did not warrant such an expenditure, and he felt that the manikin was indispensable for his work, assuming the responsibility of the purchase, he gave a note for the amount of the price, and determined to pay for it by giving lectures. This was a bold venture, but he had great faith in the attractiveness of the paper-man as an accompaniment to lectures, and this was to be the drawing-card by which the lectures were to be made profitable. The manikin was to pay for the manikin.

"It was in December when the president started out with his manikin carefully packed in the box to go to his native town, Stockbridge, and there to lecture to secure money wherewith to pay for his apparatus. It was good sleighing, but the box so filled up the sleigh that the lecturer had to ride with his feet hanging outside of the vehicle. It was not a dignified or comfortable position for a college president, who was to drive thirty miles on a cold day, but at this distance of time there is something impressive in the picture. That lonely ride, with its stern purpose, is the expression of the solitude and earnestness that marked his career as college president. It is an epitome of many long years of patient self-denying devotion to the institution to which he had given his life, and to depart from which flattering calls to positions of comparative ease did not seem to tempt him."—Mark Hopkins. By Franklin Carter. pp. 64-65.

### 19. Writing and Speaking

As an auxiliary aid in the office, far more valuable than the doubtful worth of wealth, is the power of writing well. For the duty of writing is a daily one. The opportunity of writing in book or magazine or newspaper is broad and even urgent in its insistence. The page is read by the thousands, while only a share of the thousands have part in the chapel address. The interpretation of educational function, the evaluation of new theories of education, the perils and the damages of vague methods of intellectual training, the emphasis on proper educational ideals and proper educational methods, the relationship between different types and forms and orders of education—such are a few of the many fields which, the community recognizes, the president may fruitfully cultivate. His pen should be more useful to the community than the warrior's sword. The writings of Gilman well supplemented, and, in fact, partly constituted, the worth of his academic service, and fittingly continue that worth to the succeeding generations. President Lowell's works on government illustrate the advantage of an avocation, an avocation which possesses not a few of the values of a vocation. Hyde's books on college, and other, education form no small part of the offerings of a noble career ended at its later midday. Similar interpretations might be made of British presidents and universities. The volumes of Oxford and Cambridge masters, provosts, and presi-

dents,—Warren of Magdalen, Jowett of Balliol, Benson of Magdalene,—illustrate the richness of the contribution which the executive may make.

The work of a president is one of uniformity, punctured by constant variety and diversity of duties, rights and privileges. In the uniformity and diversity, however, are found two opportunities of peculiar worth. They belong to the beginning and to the ending of the academic year. These days are, as are the days of the ship leaving port and getting into port, occasions both of great joy and of equally great peril. The beginning should be marked not simply by the formal matriculation, but also by meetings of the chief officer with both the new and returning students. To students, such meetings have deepest meanings. The president may fittingly use them, through his talks or speeches, for two purposes—first, for knowing personally the freshman; and, secondly, for introducing the freshman to college life, to its general atmosphere and conditions,—a life largely unlike the life of the fitting school in its added independence and consequent personal responsibilities. It is a life, also, unlike other forms of our manifold American society. An address by the president, too, is indeed helpful in introducing the matriculants to the college. With its history should he make the new man acquainted, and, for incarnating its ideals in himself, he should cause the new man to feel a keener quickening. With its atmosphere and conditions, the matriculant should

early be brought into virile sympathy. Certain colleges have established a freshman week or a freshman day, prior to the formal beginning, in which older undergraduates, as well as officers, seek to tell their new brothers of the many forms of student life. The leaders of glee club and orchestra, the football coaches, the editors of daily and other papers, the heads of the numerous associations and societies, interpret and seek to interest the freshman in their respective endeavors. Many and rich are the sides of this new life which the president in particular may worthily present in formal address or informal talk. One of the disadvantages of the great number of new students of each year of the present time is found in the impossibility of the president knowing personally each individual, or of the individual knowing him. It is a disadvantage which every means should be taken to remove, or at least to lessen. Chief among these means are, first, frequent, or at least occasional, talks given to the whole body of new students, or to groups of them. A second method of overcoming this disadvantage lies, as I have already said, in ease of approach to the office of the president.

At the other end of the year, or of the quartette of years, stands the Commencement Day which is, in certain ways, more significant and impressive than the day of matriculation. For, it is the conclusion of a unique privilege and of conditions formative of character. It is an opportunity for the president,

through the baccalaureate sermon and other addresses, to sum up and to emphasize all that the college stands for or has tried to do. It is a public presentation of the worth of the college to the individual and indeed to the community. It is an interpretation of the methods and means, advantages and perils, of the higher education. It is, above all else, a benediction to the departing graduate.

But the Commencement relates not simply to the departing graduate of the year. It also represents fellowship with graduates from the preceding year and years, and even of the half-century or more. It embodies reminiscence, as well as speaks a message of hopefulness. It is both historic and prophetic. To the president and to all his associates, the Commencement is a high carnival, memorial of fellowship and of friendship, of hopes consummated, of visions realized, of triumphs won. In a formal address to the alumni, the president may, like Lowell and Butler, recount the additions to endowment made in the preceding twelve months, or he may, like Tucker, seek to interpret the increasing value of the college to American, and to the world's, life. But, for both new graduates and old, the message of reminiscence or of hope is to be colored by an imagination which is at once truthful and affectionate.

Perhaps the most impressive, as well as formal, opportunity which the president has for addressing the graduates, new and old, as well as the undergraduates, is the baccalaureate sermon. Of it, one

of the most "eager, forceful, vital and dominating" [141] of all college presidents, Carter of Williams, has said:

"The baccalaureate sermon has been a distinctive feature of the New England college, and of the colleges modeled after it. As it has commonly been preached by the highest officer of the college, and is the last formal act of instruction given to a body of young men who have spent together four formative years in liberal study, it has served to mark the high estimate put upon religious instruction by our fathers, and to exhibit in a concrete way their purpose to subordinate all training to Christian doctrine and life. Few scenes are more impressive than when, even though a graduating class is not very large, a president, eminent for learning and glowing with love for the divine Master, whose daily life has been among and in his pupils, having put into one compact utterance some deep lesson suggested by the studies of the year, delivers this lesson on the last Sunday of the academical year to his retiring pupils, and enforces it by a personal and practical charge to conform the life to its meaning. Such a sermon is almost certain to issue in an exaltation of the divine Christ as the true friend, example, and Redeemer. The momentous possibilities lying before the young men, the throng of memories for them from the past, the near dissolution of precious companion-

[141] From tablet to President Carter in Chapel at Williams College.

ships, the pathetic significance of what might have been, touch the imagination of the observer, and give for all to the last lesson great dignity and tenderness.''[145] Such an opportunity the college president, whether he be a clergyman or a layman, is eager to use for the immediate impressiveness of fundamental truth and for lasting influence.

Between these two commencements (one beginning with a capital C) lie festivals which the president finds it advantageous to use. Not simply national holidays, but academic days, such as founders', may well be set aside, through addresses, to lift the college life unto a wider intellectual horizon, and unto a quickening of a nobler zeal. The value of academic uniformity, to the undergraduate, is in peril of being impaired through monotonousness. Such a peril is lessened by special academic occasions.

### 20. Reports

As a part of his service, the president, near the close of each year, makes a report to the official board. The preparation of this report is, however, often delayed till the actual completion of a year, and its publication does frequently not occur until the middle of the succeeding year. The making and presenting of such a report embodies one of the developments of the enlarged function of the university. The report takes on a great variety of forms. Some annual statements are what a report should not

[145] Mark Hopkins. By Franklin Carter. pp. 183-184.

be. The prevailing perils are twofold: first, they are meticulous, and, second, they are vague. Formally, these reports are interpretations addressed to the trustees, and, through the trustees, to faculties, to graduates, and to the whole community. If the college be a denominational one, they are also addressed to the churches on which the college relies, to a degree at least, for support. The conditions largely determine their character. A report should, however, without exception, make plain what the college has done, or tried to do, in the preceding period of twelve months. It should not refrain from recounting both its successes and its failures. It should indicate the difficulties it has met with, and the encouragements which have attended. It should interpret the service which the college desires to give in the future. It should make known the needs which are immediate and those also which are remote. It should state the problems which are arising and set forth the perils which apparently await.

Of all the reports which the close of each year has, in the preceding generations, brought forth, those of President Eliot are admittedly superior. Those of President Butler of Columbia, at the present time, are also most worthy. Eliot's are founded on patiently gathered data, interpreting the values, methods, and content of education, and are broad in suggestiveness. Butler's are of the nature of addresses made to the American people, concerning the problems and the perils of civilization as touched by the

higher education. These problems and these perils are so set forth that the university is quickened these problems to solve and these perils to avoid. Eliot's reports are interpretative studies, made for the educational administrator. Butler's are inspiring addresses, made for the public. Each type has its peculiar worth. One might add that the ideal report should unite both elements.

The contrast between the college president of to-day, embodying the constructive qualities which I have sought to outline, and the president of eighty years ago, is deep and wide. The present president embodies distinct elements for the carrying forward of a distinct calling. He is a worker and executive and is chosen to give a distinct service. The president of the earlier time was elected on the basis, in part at least, of achievements already consummated and of a reputation already won and acknowledged. Election to the office was a recognition quite as much as the opening of an opportunity. Therefore, the office was filled with men of a fame greater than is usually accorded to the president of to-day, on his accession to office. Senator George F. Hoar says, in his autobiography, speaking of his own Harvard days in the middle of the fifth decade of the last century:

"It was then the policy of the college to call into its service great men who had achieved eminent distinction in the world without. It is now its policy to select for its service promising youth, in the hope

that they will become great. Perhaps the last method is the best where it succeeds."[146]

Senator Hoar further interprets the college presidents of his own graduate days and of the years immediately following:

"Presidents Quincy, Everett, Walker and Sparks administered in succession the office of President during my connection with the Academic Department and the Law School, although Dr. Walker's inauguration was not until later. Each of them in his own way was among the first men of his time. Quincy had been an eminent statesman, a famous orator, and a most successful mayor of Boston. Edward Everett had been in his early youth one of the most famous pulpit orators of the country, afterward a distinguished Member of Congress, Governor of the Commonwealth, Minister to England, and Senator of the United States. He was a consummate orator, on whose lips thousands and thousands of his countrymen had hung entranced. He was, what is less generally remembered now, perhaps the ablest and most accomplished diplomatist ever in the public service of the United States. Jared Sparks was a profound student of history, somewhat dull as a narrator, but of unerring historic judgment. I suppose he would be placed by all our writers of history with great unanimity at the head of American historic investigators. James Walker was a great preacher and a

[146] Autobiography of Seventy Years. By George F. Hoar. Vol. I. p. 88.

profound thinker. In the judgment of his hearers, young and old, he was probably deemed nearly or quite the foremost of American preachers.

"That I may not be supposed to imply any disparagement of the present accomplished head of Harvard, let me say that while each of the men I have named had done a great work in life and achieved a great fame before he came to the Presidency, President Eliot has, in my opinion, achieved an equal fame and performed an equal work since he came to it."[147]

In all these interpretations, one consideration I find constantly emerging as an atmosphere. It relates to the mood in which the president accepts and carries forward his great office. The nature of this mood is of fundamental significance. Is the mood one of optimism or of pessimism, of hopefulness or of doubtfulness, of a sense of co-working with the best and lordliest forces, or of exclusions and seclusions and of institutional narrowness, of a sense of his ultimate triumph despite difficulties, or of final failure despite many helpfully coöperating forces? If he think of his office as an opportunity, and not as a limitation, as a chance for having any amount of fun, as one of gayety of mind and heart, and not as a leaden burden, of his associates as co-workers, to be loved, trusted, and leaned upon, not as suspecting and suspected rivals, of the public as sympathetic and eager to coöperate, and not as indifferent, of the

[147] *Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

office as a condition of freedom in which requirements are made for efficiency, and not as fettering and nagging obstacles, of it as a field for the achieving of noblest ambitions, and not as a commonplace condition equipped with commonplace forces for getting commonplace results,—if thus he thinks of the office all shall be well with him. If to the office he bring imagination, and not emotion merely, a sense of conservatism without any touch of stagnation, a sense of progressiveness without haste, and a sense of humility respecting himself, yet without self-distrust, an aptness for coöperation without shrinking or shirking, a passion for hard work for himself, a sense of caution without fear, and of courage without rashness, an appreciation of the union of continuity and of opportuneness without slowness and without intellectual thinness,—if he thus interpret and feel his office, he shall at last lay it down with deep satisfaction in himself, and with a gratitude on the part of his co-workers which he feels he has not earned. His whole mood is indeed of chief worth, of a worth far greater than are the individual elements which help to make him a great officer.

I could name presidents having individual excellencies, many and marked, whose general mood was bad, and whose administrations were, from the first day, doomed to only a half-success. I could name also other presidents whose mood (*plus,* of course, individual excellencies, and, be it added, not without individual weaknesses and limitations) has borne

their colleges unto new and nobler heights of worth and of service. One can easily trace the progress across the continent,—from Hyde in Maine, Tucker in New Hampshire, Buckham in Vermont, Alice Freeman Palmer in Massachusetts, Andrews in Rhode Island (and Ohio and Nebraska), Woolsey in Connecticut, McCosh in New Jersey, Nott in New York, Fairchild in Ohio, Northrop in Minnesota, to the great worthies of the Pacific coast. These all, and others who now must be nameless, wrought well, possessed by the mood, human, hopeful, exultant, triumphing.

It may be added that it requires no peculiar power of insight to recognize the fact that the mood is of equal worth in callings other than the academic.

In considering many great matters, one finally turns back to either Plato or Aristotle. At the conclusion of this lengthy chapter, therefore, I go back to Aristotle for a comprehensive consummation of much which I have been trying to say. In his "Politics," he says: "There are three qualifications required in those who have to fill the highest offices—(1) first of all, loyalty to the established constitution; (2) the greatest administrative capacity; (3) virtue and justice of the kind proper to each form of government."[148] Let the president have these three qualities or elements, and also all that they connote, and it shall be well with his college, well with all that the

[148] Aristotle's "Politics." Translated by Benjamin Jowett. (Oxford Edition, 1920) p. 213.

college serves, and well with him, both as an officer and as a personality.

Yet as I conclude this chapter, and review what I have written regarding the noble traits and forces of the president, I do not fail to see how meaningless and futile are many of its interpretations. For have we not all known presidents who, possessing many, or most, of the great qualities named, have yet failed to win best results in their administration? Have we not also known presidents who, lacking many, or most, of these qualities, have yet won the best results? Of course, conditions may have been against the first set; conditions may also have been favorable to the second set. But, after all credits and debits have been properly balanced, it is the man himself, being a personality composed of unnumbered forces, who serves ill or who serves well. In the college presidency, as in every form of service, it is the human being, analyzed or unanalyzed, interpreted or uninterpreted, who is supreme.

## CHAPTER IV

### PERILS

THE great qualities characterizing the president, the great elements constituting his character and his administration, the great work which he seeks to do, however, do not free him from certain perils, also great, perhaps equally great. For it would be hard to exaggerate the gravity of these perils. They may work harm and damage, either immediate or lasting and frequently fundamental. These perils, becoming forceful, result in inefficiency in service, in personal unhappiness throughout the term, and in institutional disintegration. Seth Low of Columbia is reported to have said that it is the function of the president to give and to receive pain. Bliss Perry, of broad observation, likewise says:

"A president must have many qualifications for his office—I have heard a cautious observer say—but his first need is a thick skin. Undoubtedly, by some wise provision of Nature, the skin grows thicker with exposure, but there is a curiously prevalent impression that a president's conscience is liable to a corresponding induration. A cynical-minded friend of

mine, of large discourse in these matters, avers that such are the temptations peculiar to the office, that of all the college presidents he has known, only two remained Christians. These two—if I may be permitted to say so without discourtesy to the others—are both dead."[149] A former president of Reed College, an interpreter of broad understanding, William Trufant Foster, declares that the majority of college presidents are failures:

"A majority of college and university presidents in the United States have failed, on the whole, to perform, to the satisfaction of those most intimately concerned, the various duties now assigned to that office. If I were to class as failures those who have proved unequal to one or more of the obligations usually attached to the office, there would remain in the successful group scarcely a score. And who knows what reduction would appear in this small list if it were submitted for approval to a representative group of university leaders—let us say, to the American Association for the Advancement of Science?"[150]

The interpretation which Foster makes seems to me somewhat severe. The successes or failures in college presidencies bear about the same proportion to each other which successes or failures hold in other

[149] The Life of a College Professor. By Bliss Perry. Scribner's Magazine. Vol. XXII, October, 1897. p. 517.

[150] The College Presidency. By William Trufant Foster. Science, New Series, Vol. XXXVII, No. 957, May 2, 1913. p. 654.

highly specialized professions.[151] If one is to interpret the results in terms of percentage,—in many respects a bad method to apply to conditions so essentially indefinite and complex,—I should say that about fifteen per cent of presidencies are successful to a very high degree, and about ten per cent are failures. Of the remaining seventy-five per cent, the following might be a somewhat just division: ten per cent are highly successful; fifteen per cent moderately successful; ten per cent somewhat successful; ten per cent neutral; and the remaining thirty per cent are more or less failures. The chances are, therefore, on the whole favorable to a happy conclusion.[152]

[151] The records of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, covering a thousand medical students, for a long period, give these results:

" 23 achieved distinguished success.
66 achieved considerable success.
507 achieved fair success.
124 achieved very limited success.
56 failed.
96 left the profession.
87 died within twelve years of commencing practice.
41 died while students."—The Psychology of Educational Administration and Criticism. By F. H. Hayward. p. 233.

[152] I may be allowed to add that, since I retired from the office of the presidency of a university, and while engaged in writing this book, two inferences have become increasingly evident: first, that my early judgment of the proportion of presidents who are having a successful career has been enlarged; and, secondly, that my appreciation of the perils belonging to the presidency of a university has greatly increased.

Presidents, unlike professors, come to their office without specific training. There is no professional school to educate presidents. Their sea is often uncharted, and their orders sealed. If not sealed, the orders may be either obscure or vague, or even contradictory. For the academic pilot, the reckoning is sometimes dead, and, be it added, is occasionally deadening.

But the future of the office touches closely on the preparation for the office. Is any preparation possible? If possible, is any preparation wise, or practicable? If practicable, what should be the character of the preparation?

A college presidency is not a profession. Though dealing necessarily with intellectual concerns, the office is not primarily, like the law, for instance, intellectual. Though using scientific conditions, forces, methods, it is not scientific. It is primarily an administrative or executive calling. It is an art. It consists in doing. In the doing, however, are included methods scientific, forces intellectual, aims professional. Though knowledge of its processes is helpful, even necessary, it is an art which cannot be learned from books. Being an art, it is learned by doing. Being a collection of many arts, it is learned by doing many things and through manifold experiences. Emerson says, in his essay on "Life and Letters in New England," "It takes sixteen hundred and eighty men to make one Man, complete in all the facul-

ties.'' [153] The office is fundamentally a personality, a great personality. The many qualities, which I have sought to assess as constituting a good president, might be embodied in a single man, and yet he might be a poor president. He might also lack many of these qualities, and yet be a good president. Emerson also says, ''Men are as they think.'' [154] It is equally true that men think as they are. This is especially true of the president. His being is chief and central, and determines his reasoning processes. Let him be great, and the office is greatly filled and greatly influential. Therefore, special training is as impossible as is special training for life. When there can be training for eloquence of speech, or for heroism, or for parenthood, then there can be special training for the college presidency. Yet, as one may put himself under conditions which acquaint him with eloquent speech, or with heroism in deed or atmosphere, or with proper life of the home, so one may put himself under conditions which give acquaintance with the problems, the personalities, the methods, the forces, the limitations which belong to a college president. These conditions are fundamentally found in the college itself. Vigorous teachers, wise and sympathetic deans, form good material for the making of the college president. So likewise do clergymen who have scholarly aptitudes. So like-

[153] Centenary Edition. Vol. X. p. 350.
[154] *Ibid.*, Vol. XII. p. 121.

wise do scientists who have deep sympathies with youth.

The perils of the college president are easily distinguished as belonging to his condition, or environment,—the exterior dangers,—and those belonging to the things personal, or of official relationship,—subjective. Of the two types, of course, the subjective are far more serious.

Of the perils which lie without, however, four forms are chief: first, the peril historic, belonging to the traditions of the college organization; second, the peril administrative, springing from local conditions; third, the peril political, arising from the relation of the president to partisanship; and, fourth, the peril ecclesiastical, originating in the association of a college with a church. These forms of danger are far less common and virulent than of old, but they are still rife, altogether too rife.

First. The peril historic arises from those personal antipathies which beset communities, particularly older and small ones. Such communities, in which a college may be placed, seem to breed personal and class antagonisms. These perils belong to the general community, and also they seem to have a special affinity, in certain conditions, to the president, to fellow officers, and to all associates. It is to be expected that certain members of both board and faculty may believe that his administration is not wise, or, if wise, is not forceful, or, if both wise and forceful, is lacking in respect for traditions or in regard

for certain personalities. The president may be criticized as unjust in his relationship to the several departments of instruction. It is believed that he is sacrificing the natural sciences to the interest of the human philosophies, and that both are made to suffer by reason of the large appropriations given to the department of modern languages. It is often said that certain groups in the faculty are "running" the president. He is both arraigned and pitied as a victim of strong personalities whose interests are supposed to be selfish and departmental. His policies are liable to be charged with undue conservatism by some, and by others as tending toward a progressiveness which spells radicalism. By some he is indicted as extravagant in expenditure, and by others as guilty of penuriousness, and, in either case, with the consequent disintegration of the college. By some, he is accused as being indifferent to personal relationships; by others as guilty of personal favoritism.

One of the greatest of presidents was Tappan of the University of Michigan.[155] His administration contained many of the best elements. In a way most unfitting, he was finally, and suddenly, "removed" by the Board of Regents. Antagonisms between the Board of Visitors and the Board of Regents prevailed. He struggled in vain against what apparently was

[155] Commemorative Oration. By James Burrill Angell. The Semi-Centennial Celebration of the University of Michigan, 1887. pp. 170-173, 174. American State Universities, and the University of Michigan. By Andrew Ten Brook. pp. 217-255.

inevitable. The sorrowful ending of his career, however, should not at all obscure the formative character of his administration, a value which President Angell heartily commended to me. But, as President Andrew D. White has said, "He had certain 'defects of his qualities.'" President White, for a time his colleague, also interprets a condition which, alas! is not unique:

"Big, hearty, frank, and generous, he [Tappan] easily became the prey of those who wrought upon his feelings; and, in an evil hour, he was drawn into a quarrel not his own, between two scientific professors. This quarrel became exceedingly virulent; at times it almost paralyzed the university, and finally it convulsed the State. It became the main object of the doctor's thoughts. The men who had drawn him into it quietly retired under cover, and left him to fight their battle in the open. He did this powerfully, but his victories were no less calamitous than his defeats; for one of the professors, when overcome, fell back upon the church to which he belonged, and its conference was led to pass resolutions warning Christian people against the university. The forces of those hostile to the institution were marshaled to the sound of sectarian drum. The quarrel at last became political; and when the doctor unwisely entered the political field in hopes of defeating the candidates put forward by his opponents, he was beaten at the polls, and his resignation followed. A small number of us, including Judge Cooley and Professors Frieze,

Fasquelle, Boise, and myself, simply maintained an 'armed neutrality,' standing by the university, and refusing to be drawn into this whirlpool of intrigue and objurgation. Personally, we loved the doctor. Every one of us besought him to give up the quarrel, but in vain. He would not; he could not. It went on till the crash came. He was virtually driven from the State, retired to Europe, and never returned." [156]

Such methods, conditions, conclusions, represent unwise judgment, as well as administrative antagonisms and personal bitterness. The president, above all other men, should hold himself responsible either for their avoiding or for their settlement.

As a part of the peril historic, the relation of a president to his predecessor has a place. This relation inevitably takes on diverse forms, according to the character of the predecessor, and according to the nature of the predecessor's service. But, in general, a president is liable not to give proper heed to the recent history of the university which he is called to serve. Such neglect seems to be a temptation almost natural and inevitable. Even Horace Mann has been accused of yielding to such a general condition. So intent is the thought of the new pilot on his own duties that he is prone to forget the worth of the work done by the officer who already has left the academic

[156] Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White. Vol. I. pp. 280-281.

The records show that Tappan was "removed."

bridge. But there are at least three points on which his thought may fittingly be fixed. He, the new master, is to remember that he continues the work of the old master. Fittingly, even necessarily, to that work does he make additions,—but seldom substitutions. He is not to tear down, but to build up. He is indeed not to forget that he is building on other men's foundations. If the preceding service has been good, he is not to cease continuing it, and he is to seek to make it even better. If that service has been weak, aimless, ineffective, he is to supply strength, direction, and forcefulness. He is to endeavor to adjust services to each other in orderly succession unto richest and most enduring results. With this adjusting continuation is to be united a keen sense of gratitude,—personal gratitude, indeed,—for the privilege of having been given a place in the academic succession. With this highest personal gratitude is to be joined a deep appreciation of the achievements of preceding administrations. Indeed, this appreciation may well go back to the beginnings of the college. No president, or other officer, can read the history of the typical American college or university without a thrill as he reflects on the worthies who have wrought righteousness, who, in the face of poverty, have upheld the standards of scholarship, who were patient and forceful in tribulation, who bore aloft and passed on the torch, and who defended the academic tabernacles in Philistia. Every newcomer into the presidential office should have deep respect for all those who have contributed to make his present office one of rich and

happy privilege, and not one of hard and grinding duty.

Second. Under the peril administrative, I wish to include two or three particular dangers. One of these is the danger of routine. In a long administration, if it be good, or even if it be bad, the ease of thinking and of doing in and through a well-recognized method may become an easily worn habit which makes for stagnation. It is liable to result in a lack of intellectual growth. Tradition is a heavy, and often a cold and deadening, hand. Its value is to be recognized, but it is not to be suffered to block progress. The president is to be gifted with initiative in and for a life which inevitably tends toward uniformity.

The peril of routine has also peculiar reference to the different ages of the life of the president and to the successive periods of a long administration. The fast-coming and faster-going decades bear their own responsive opportunities and inevitable temptations. The score of years from forty to sixty should be the richest in educational achievement. The decade following the age of sixty, if good health be maintained, should also be fruitful. In this whole period, however, the president should keep the enthusiasms and vitalities of the earlier years, and should find himself becoming better seasoned with judicial reasonableness. The appreciation of his own limitations, of the limitations of his environment, and even of the limitations of his colleagues, should become, and usually does become, more just. He should learn what lines on the

academic page to emphasize, and what to pass over lightly. He should not be blind or indifferent to what cannot be done. Neither should he be indifferent to the dangers of his middle age, or of the middle period or latter part of his career. In general, as I have said, the dangers may be summed up in the peril of the deadening effect of routine. The wearing and deadening effects of routine are vastly lessened by two forces or qualities: first, by a happy humor and a keen wit. A sense of humor and a keenness of wit have also a positively healthful value, as well as a curative. Of course, the quality may be so exercised as to defeat its primary purposes. It may lead to irrelevances, and irrelevances easily fall into eccentricities, and the eccentricities may readily become indiscretions,—results which delay the progress of immediate business, and which also may impair the respect which the president has the right to claim and which his colleagues wish to give. But, happy the president, and happy his associates, who possesses a large sense of humor and a still larger sense for using his humor fittingly. Northrop and the younger Dwight, of the presidents of the last half-century, are the most moving examples.

A second force for removing, or at least for lessening, the effect of routine lies in the use of the imagination. As to the architect, so to the president, the imagination is of primary worth. He is called to see the unseen, to paint the bare canvas, to construct in his mind what he wishes to do and to achieve. He

is to be the poet, the real maker of things unsung and as yet unseen. For trustees and for faculty, for graduates, and for the community, he is to hold out the vision splendid, and to prophesy the happy triumphs of the university yet to be. Such a vision quickens all, and to him it brings cheer, as he walks his weary way.

In the peril administrative should also be included another constant danger, which, however, becomes less with the increasing enlargement of the educational function. In the former time, the president served also as the head of a department of instruction. For better or for worse, usually with inevitableness, he now is set free from such a duty. Yet, in case he is still made the head of a department, it is of serious importance that the department should have no higher rank than would allow it to be coördinate with other departments. It should never be suffered to receive special advantages. For, I have known instances in which the president permitted his department of instruction to be built up at the expense of other subjects, and with results which, beginning in small lapses, led to disasters. In fact, it is well for him, being professor as well as president, to request that his department should be regarded as even subordinate. For, he ought to do all that is fitting to promote the cultivation of other fields, even at the expense of his own. Generosity is one of his privileges.

Another form of the peril administrative is the

danger of becoming adversely critical and firmly negative. It is said that it was customary for a bishop of London, in the middle of the last century, to make three remarks to each caller: the first, "What is your name?"; the second, "What do you want?"; the third, "No." The president is in peril of being possessed by the spirit out of which such remarks spring. He may come to feel that the requests are so many and so imperative, the reasons for making these requests so few and so slender, the petitioners themselves so unappreciative of conditions, that for him the only way, safe and certain, is to give a universal negative. Of course, his own irritation, or his own irritability, is a partial ground for the negative mood. But the condition and the causes leading up to the making of it are most unfortunate. If the occasional mood be suffered to become constant, he himself has only one path open to his choice. Rather, indeed, he is ever to seek to be constructive, positively and firmly constructive, in plan, and purpose, and condition. Of a formative and positive gospel of optimism, he is to be the preacher.

Third. The peril which I have called political is most liable to arise in the course of a national election, and especially in the case of a campaign which puts moral, or semi-moral, issues before the voters. The academic, like the general, community becomes excited. The individual's feelings confuse his intellect. Few see straight or think clearly. Personal antagonisms are created. Logic is flung to the hot

and swift emotional winds. Rumor is fast afoot. Superficial evidences are interpreted as proofs. The heart's feelings are affirmed as principles. In such a condition, the president may be guilty of indiscretions in statement. If not thus guilty, he may in calm judgment take a position which arouses bitter partisan criticism. The peril of such criticism, however, the president is obliged to meet, and to meet with altruism of spirit and sustained soberness of judgment. For in the whole American political constituency, no one has a clearer duty of judicial and fearless speech in national crises than the chief officer of an institution whose motto is "*Veritas,*" or "*Lux.*" It may be noted that Bascom, president of Wisconsin, and professor at Williams, constantly exhibited a noble independence of judgment and frankness of statement.

To determine what should be the relations of a president to a partisan movement is a problem, in part geographical, in part institutional, in part historical, in part personal. It is axiomatic enough that the president is first and foremost a citizen. It is also evident,—though not quite so evident, —that he is not justified in using his presidency as an organ for political propaganda. It is also plain to some, though not to all, that the president is not justified in being a partisan leader in a republican democracy. He is not justified in writing or speaking in behalf of partisan issues. His first duty is to and through his presidency. By means of this office, he

makes his richest contribution to human betterment. No partisan zealousness should be suffered to interfere with the highest usefulness of that office. Of course, in these several intimations of his civic rights and duties are found degrees of definiteness, or of indefiniteness, with which his trained reason and responsive conscience are to deal, and are to deal for the purpose of making just, ultimate decisions. In all partisan debates of a political campaign, heat, and not light, is developed. Campaign managers seek to enroll presidents under their banners and to secure declarations from them in favor of their platforms, and affirming loyalty to their candidates. In such a furnace, uncharitableness is prone to abound. Maledictions are uttered, hatred is fostered, threats of all sorts are made, bitterness of atmospheres is created. A few weeks after a national election, all such moods seem thoroughly unworthy, and such declarations silly. Antagonisms presently cease. The partisan storm becomes a calm. The comprehensive inference thence to be drawn is that that college president is wise who obliges his loyalty to his office to determine, or at least to influence, other loyalties.[157]

In respect to this whole complex question, President Lowell has made a discrimination, both sane in differentiation and safe as a method of conduct. He says:

"Surely abuse of speech, abuse of authority and

[157] A wise interpretation of the president's duty is found in the New York Times. October 25, 1924.

arbitrary restraint and friction would be reduced if men kept in mind the distinction between the privilege of academic freedom and the common right of personal liberty as a citizen, between what may properly be said in the class-room and what in public. But it must not be forgotten that all liberty and every privilege implies responsibilities. Professors should speak in public soberly and seriously, not for notoriety or self advertisement, under a deep sense of responsibility for the good name of the institution and the dignity of their profession. They should take care that they are understood to speak personally, not officially. When they so speak, and governing boards respect their freedom to express their sincere opinions as other citizens may do, there will be little danger that liberty of speech will be either misused or curtailed." [158]

Fourth. The fourth type of exterior peril is ecclesiastic. This peril, of course, specially besets the president of the denominational college. It is the danger of the charge of heresy. The charge may be founded upon evidence insufficient. But the insufficiency does not prevent its dissemination and its acceptance. The charge may also have a sound basis. In either case, the president is to recognize it and to deal with it as large and honest judgment dictates. When President George Harris was called from a professorship in Andover Theological Seminary to the

[158] President's Report: Reports of the President and the Treasurer of Harvard College, 1916-17. p. 21.

presidency of Amherst College, he was obliged to meet the criticism of those who had opposed the theological school on the ground of its doctrinal liberalism. To a degree, also President Tucker, going from Andover to Dartmouth, was obliged likewise to suffer. The presidents in several Baptist colleges have, in recent years, been subject to charges brought by the "fundamentalists." These charges, however, have not been confined to denominational colleges and their presidents. State legislatures, such as those of Kentucky and of Texas, have tried to put upon their statute books laws prohibiting the teaching in the state's schools of certain biological theories regarding the origin of man. Tennessee succeeded. Some members of these bodies have threatened to seek to discontinue appropriations on the ground that the doctrine of evolution was taught. Be it said that the presidents of state universities have usually met such a peril with courage, with confidence in the truths of both science and religion, with sound judgment, with confidence in the sober second thought of the people, and, as a result, without a diminution of income.

The subjective perils, however, which beset the president are far more serious and complex than those arising from his environment.

Of the several perils which I am about to name, the first is perhaps the most comprehensive, covering all which are to follow, in the catalogue which might be made very long. It is the peril of smallness. The

president is not big enough for his job, or the job is much bigger than he is. It would not be worth while to allude to this general fact as a specific condition were it not apparently a condition sometimes—it might be said, not infrequently—obtaining in a very definite form. The president received a small deposit at birth: nature was not generous. Subsequent education failed to give the desired increase. Experience did not make proper additions. He has not only seen through a glass darkly, but his dark glass has proved to be a small glass, too. He belongs not only to the servant class where all do belong, but also to the servile class. He lacks knowledge, appreciation, inspiration, application, power. Such a man, of course, is seldom selected for the great office; yet instances are not lacking. The type takes on many forms. One form may be of extreme humility. Another form may be of high arrogance. A president may be guilty of boyish bumptiousness, failing to be conscious of limitations which others recognize altogether too plainly. He may even use his boastfulness as a stepping stone to advancement. Such a president was once known to me, a president whom a board of trustees suffered, whom a faculty suffered, and suffered for more than a decade. Such a president is often a victim, be it confessed. For he is especially impotent, in the present age, to meet the duties of his place. Professors pity him. Students contemn him. He is unable to secure from faculty or from trustees a proper support for a proper number of proper

teachers. He is unable to give good housing for students. He is unable to get just salaries from trustees for teachers. Particularly, at the present time, in the condition of academic unsettlement, his smallness becomes painful as a fact, and disastrous as a result.

In contrast with the man of such a type, I wish to lay down an interpretation, made by Arthur Christopher Benson of Eton and of Cambridge, concerning Edmund Warre. Warre was headmaster of Eton in the years between 1909 and 1918. Of him, Benson says:

"Anyone who came in contact with him, and particularly in the years of his Headmastership, must have instinctively felt that he was in the presence of a very great man. . . . His strength lay in a secret force of character, overwhelming in volume rather than distinct in quality, which was not very obvious at first sight, because it was in no way superficial; nor did it flow in the accustomed channels so much as underlie all that he did or said. I worked under him for twenty years, and can only say that my consciousness of his real greatness increased upon me every year that I knew him. . . . I am sure, though it is hard to put into words, that Warre's almost preternatural effect was produced by some inner greatness, not so much of mind or even of heart, though he was an intensely warm-hearted and kindly man, as of the inner subconscious self which plays so much larger a part in our lives than we have till quite lately known. This was not mere energy, nor even

fearlessness—he was in some ways an anxious-minded and even timid man—nor was it patience or deliberateness, for he was often too much in a hurry; it was simply a strong and forceful current of personality, which permeated the whole place with its steady flow."[159]

There is a further peril, and one also of a comprehensive nature, which might possibly be described as intellectual blindness. The president may lack a clear intellectual conception of his conditions, personal and physical. He also may be feeble in his understanding of the whole process of university service. The whole process is to him mysterious, or semi-mysterious. He becomes involved in his thinking. The administrative condition, which demands force, force supported by reason and judgment calm and clear, is a labyrinth, unknown or only half known. Casualties arrive or survive. Plottings are common, mean and small. Conspiracies of large or minor relationships emerge. He—the president—fails to understand or to appreciate. The result is inevitable, and the result is a sad one.

Such a condition seems to have obtained in the university at Knoxville in the middle of the year 1923. The complexities of the conditions are well illustrated in such questions as were proposed to the professors:

"1. What do you know about or what have you

[159] Memories and Friends. By Arthur Christopher Benson. pp 99, 100, 122.

had to do with the proposed constitution for the University of Tennessee?

"2. Are you in sympathy with the present administration of the University of Tennessee, and the present way of doing things?

"3. What did you have to do with the publication of the anonymous leaflet 'Truth' directly or indirectly?

"4. Have you attended any meetings dealing with the case of Dr. Jesse William Sprowls or any other meetings at which the administrative policy of the university was discussed?

"5. Are you a member of the American Association of University Professors?

"6. Did you sign the petition asking for an investigation of the Sprowls case by this association?

"7. What do you know about criticism and dissatisfaction expressed by other members of the faculty and who else in the faculty has discussed it?" [160]

In certain relations, presidents are in peril, too, of forgetting one of the great human lessons: the lesson that it is useless to quarrel with the nature of things. It is one of the primary teachings of Don Quixote. To allow one's self to make this attempt is to invite disaster. The chief element for the president in the nature of things is human nature. The president who fails to remember that human nature belongs to and

[160] School and Society. Vol. XVIII, No. 446, July 14, 1923. p. 42.

abides in every board of trustees, and to and in all faculties, has forgotten a most important truth. If he finds he is unable to adjust himself properly to either body, only one recourse is left. Of course, he is to use the judgment of McCosh of Princeton, the tact of Angell of Michigan, and the wit of the younger Dwight of Yale, in making every desired adjustment. But, if all endeavors fail, he is to be content with resigning.

Too often in any such complex condition, the president is prone to think he is standing for a principle. Perhaps he is. Often his friends and supporters demand that he shall not retire. Intimations of cowardice are easily and frequently made. But the history of academic administrations proves that such antagonisms easily result in the retarding of educational progress, in the disintegration of the college machine, and in the final embarrassment of the president himself.

One general intellectual peril of the college president is the peril of what may be called the lack of synthesis. Comte has indicated in his interpretation of the progressiveness of humanity, that synthesis is of a higher order than analysis. It has likewise more important meaning for the president. Presidents are more able to analyze than they are to put things together; but to put things together is far more important. Trustees like a definite, comprehensive program. They have a right to demand such a program. With a definite program, they can deal,

criticizing, commending, eliminating, adding. To deal with a loosely drawn program is as difficult as to cut a pillow with a sword. Such a definite program, a president should be glad to submit and to keep before the members of the board. To such a program, adopted by the trustees, he can work, with both a sense of support and also with a sense of his definite leading to a desired conclusion.

The same peril of personal inadequacy may appear in yet another form, a form which may be interpreted as inefficiency. The so-called executive does not do things. He lacks the qualities of an executive, such as foresight, comprehensiveness of vision, promptness, courage, forcefulness. He is a thinker, but a thinker only, not a doer; a teacher, not an administrator; an interpreter, not a leader. He is the man of the philosophic type which the colleges of the earlier time were inclined to select as their head. The occupant of the chair of philosophy and of metaphysics may be greater in most important respects than the president, but, as a rule, he makes a poor president. Of course, there are exceptions. Wayland and Robinson of Brown, Walker of Harvard, Hopkins of Williams, Hyde of Bowdoin, are among the more conspicuous. But, as a rule, great philosophers are not great executives. The remark, however true, is yet no more true than to say that great executives are seldom great philosophers.

Yet these comprehensive, but distinct, perils of inadequacy and inefficiency, do not blind one to yet

larger dangers. One of these dangers is autocracy. The academic autocrat possesses rich advantages and is offered broad opportunities. But these advantages are seriously vitiated, and the opportunities fundamentally disintegrated, by his lack of knowledge, or by his want of tact. His seeming omnipotence does not command an equally apparent omniscience. The autocratic method fast gives way to the democratic, and ought to give way. But, though the method may be vanishing, the mood yet lingers. I frequently hear presidents speak of "my faculty," or "my deans," in such a tone as a householder uses in speaking of "my servants," or a farmer uses in describing "my barns." One president has absolute power in respect to calling and dismissing his colleagues, a power given to him by the board of trustees. Another, though not quite so absolute a monarch, arrogates to himself the conducting of academic affairs in ways which create personal dislike and official antagonism. Instances are numberless. I have already cited not a few of them.

In his internal administration, moreover, the president is in constant peril of the temptation of interference with the content or doctrine of the teaching of the class- or lecture-room. The peril is more manifest in the departments of economics, of biology, of philosophy and psychology. The peril, moreover, is not confined to the president. The board of trustees shares his dangers. At times both the president and the board yield. I know, intimately, a college located

in an industrial center of which, many years ago, a trustee asked his colleagues to consider the question of reprimanding a teacher who was guilty of teaching the doctrine of free trade. Biology, also, is a specially tempting field for interference. For biology has close affiliations with Biblical theology. College presidents, startled or stirred by legislation, made or attempted, have been prone to warn professors of biology not to teach, or even to consider, evolution or Darwinism. Philosophy and psychology are sisters of theology, at times each inclined to be jealous of the other. But a president of a denominational college is often afraid that the confidence of his church in the institution may be shaken by intimations of radical teaching. Under such considerations, the president is to be guided by two principles, or methods of action: first, to select, in advance, the best teachers possible for each department, remembering ever that the best teaching is always that of an expert, of an expert touched by great human relationships; and, secondly, absolutely to trust such teachers. Moreover, his mood and attitude are not to be simply negative. He is to seek to be helpful in every possible form and way. Such a mood was expressed, many years ago, by President Eliot in saying:

"During recent years every College teacher has been forced to answer anew the personal questions—what can I best teach, and how shall I teach it? The younger men have been aided and guided somewhat by their elders in the same department; but

every man has really been obliged to take up new subjects and to treat them in new methods. There is not a single member of the Faculty who is to-day teaching what he taught fifteen years ago as he then taught it. Without any guidance from precedents, and under many restrictions from lack of appliances and resources, each teacher has had to recast his own work, each department repeatedly to modify and extend its series of courses, and the Faculty as a whole to invent, readjust, and expand the comprehensive framework within which all these rapid changes and steady growth have taken place.''[161] Such too was the attitude of Gilman. One of his early colleagues says:

''He was always sympathetic and glad to listen to anything we would tell him about our work and always seemed to be doing his best to understand it, no matter how technical it was, so that we all felt, along with a sense that he always had the final decision with regard to all our appointments and promotions, that he had a personal as well as official satisfaction in anything we did.''[162] The ease of maintaining such a mood and attitude is increased through the president himself being a teacher. If he is not an expert, as were Angell, Jordan, Hall, and therefore fitted to give instruction, he yet will ever find himself in deeper sympathy with his associates,

[161] Annual Reports of the President and Treasurer of Harvard College, 1888-89. p. 8.

[162] Life and Confessions of a Psychologist. By G. Stanley Hall. pp. 252-253.

as well as with students, in giving lectures or talks on matters academic or of public interest.[163]

A sane interpretation of a sane autocratic system, whose application would avoid the peril of interference, is also given by President Hyde, in saying:

"The men who have clear views of educational policy, who have a just sense of proportion between the several departments of instruction, who are able to judge men not merely for their individual attainments, but for their capacity to fit into a complicated intellectual machine, and contribute to the whole the most which this particular position, under the given circumstances, is able to render, are not numerous. Either a president is such a man, or he is not. If he is such a person, the wisest thing a board of trustees can do is to trust him implicitly. If he is not such a

[163] "It has always seemed to me that if a university president is to exert a stimulating influence on students, he should never relinquish the opportunities of the classroom. Again, as I have already implied, to judge the work of scholars accurately he himself should be a scholar, which condition he can maintain only through some form of actual research. Without personal effort toward the extension of knowledge, he is likely to fall out of harmony with scholarship and thus fail in his most important duty —the selection of progressive men. Moreover, a university head is subject to the foible of omniscience, being expected by the public to speak with authority on almost every conceivable subject. Lacking the discipline of research, he is in danger of being satisfied with second-hand knowledge and of drifting with the current along lines of least resistance."—The Days of a Man. By David Starr Jordan. Vol. I, p. 298.

person, the sooner they get rid of him the better. Autocracy tempered by assassination is the ideal government. By autocracy I do not mean arbitrariness or conceit or caprice. The educational autocrat should consult the reasonable claims of students, seek the advice of the faculty individually and collectively, confer with members of his board of trustees, get the views of experts in other institutions as to the qualifications of his candidate. But when his mind is made up as a result of these many inquiries and varied considerations, he has a right to expect his judgment to carry more weight than that of merchants or judges or clergymen, who, however eminent in those fields to which they have given special attention, cannot in the nature of the case have given as much consideration to the particular problem in hand as it is his prerogative and duty to do. The president has a right to have each professor in the institution one whom he has either accepted from his predecessor when he took the office, or whom he has personally approved at the time of his election. There are great risks in trusting so much power to any individual. In the hands of an unwise man such power may harm an institution for a generation, but the policy of divided counsels and appointments without expert approval is an even greater risk, and will ruin an institution forever.'' [164]

The peril of autocracy is liable to show itself in

[164] The College Man and The College Woman. By William DeWitt Hyde. pp. 287-289.

attempts in what is called scientific management. Scientific management represents the administration of a university as if it were a cotton factory, or a blast furnace. It stands for units of production, for time-cards, for time-clocks, for the ringing of bells. It intimates that the faculty is a trade union. Of course, the mere statement of the method proves its valuelessness, or even harmfulness. For the methods and results of a university are human and not material, scholarly and not industrial. To enlarge the boundaries of the field of knowledge and to give education are purposes which cannot be interpreted in foot-pounds.

In fact, a tendency in administration is the tendency of substituting machinery for personality. It is a not unnatural tendency in an age that demands immediate results. But, in the deeper interpretation, it is not a natural tendency. For machinery can be made. Personality is life and growth. The one is easy to install and to run; the other hard to get and to hold. Both wear out; but the place of the one can be frequently and readily supplied, the place of the other only at high cost. For it is ever to be remembered that the college and university is the place of education and of investigation. Education and investigation are primarily matters of mind, and secondarily matters of machinery. Every attempt, therefore, should be made, and should be made constantly, to lessen the machinery to the lowest point

of doing the work which is to be done. The endeavor, moreover, should be constant and sincere not to employ secretaries, clerks, and assistants of many sorts beyond the point of their largest usefulness. It is to be borne in mind that the university is a soul. The soul may be housed in a body, and through the body it performs many functions. The university requires tools and materials. But the tools and materials are ever to be subordinated to the inner spirit. The management may be scientific in the sense of forethought, orderliness, freedom from waste, but it is not to be scientific in respect to the abnegation or subordination of personality. Personality, as cause, condition, and result, is supreme. The greatest of all elements in professor, in president, is fullness of life, a fullness of life such as Pepper possessed, such also as Phillips Brooks possessed,—a quality indeed which seemed rather to possess the great provost and the great preacher, creating and sustaining each.

Yet it is to be noted that, in not a few instances, the general effect of executive work on the executive himself is to produce a certain emotional hardness. With this hardness is often joined an element of self-appreciation which may mount up (or sink down) into excessive self-laudation. The college executive is hardly less free from such evil tendencies than is any other executive. Many presidents are conscious of the sinister influence. Harper of Chicago once said to a

friend, "If ever you see me becoming conscious of my almightiness, seize me, throw me down, and crush me!"

Autocracy may take on a special form or application, furthermore, which represents another peril, namely, condescension. Condescension is the habit of the pseudo-gentleman, as autocracy may be, but is not always, the habit of the real gentleman. It is a vice which is peculiarly irritating to the members of a faculty. Examples are known to every president, and are known and felt by many professors. The reader may think of a president who has served at least two universities, and who is just retiring from the mastership of a third. He is the gentleman, lord of a goodly, income-bearing heritage, happy in his superiority, believing that his retainers should also be likewise happy in their association with himself. Such condescendingness is, in certain types of character, the personal and official result of autocracy.

These two opposite perils of autocracy and condescendingness seem to bring forth a third and a yet more comprehensive peril: it concerns the effect of the presidential office on the man himself holding it. The effects are as different as are the characters of the presidents themselves. For those who fail, it is liable to leave in their hearts an emotional flavor of bitterness. They are prone to interpret their failure, and perhaps rightly, as caused by the narrowness, or by the personal enmities, of their associates. They also often find it a bit difficult to reinstate themselves

in a proper employment. This difficulty adds bitterness to bitterness. In case their term has been successful, the office has usually served to give breadth to intellectual interpretation, sympathy in personal relations, vigor in all endeavors. Northrop and Angell were made greater men and nobler citizens by their historic terms in the commonwealths of Minnesota and of Michigan, great and noble as they were when they came from Connecticut or from Vermont. If a president like Eliot has helped to make the office of the presidency of Harvard College great, and also has added dignity to the presidency of every worthy college, the office itself—just as frequently and as fully—makes the man himself great.

A further danger of the president, which is primarily subjective and yet belongs somewhat to his environment, is the peril of impulsiveness. This peril shows itself in speaking or in writing on controversial questions before taking thought. Presidents of even the intellectual type seem especially liable to its invasion. Questions of so-called race discrimination, questions of partisan politics, questions of the Roman Catholic organization, touch sensitive chords in the American conscience and character. The president, asked questions by a newspaper reporter on these and like problems, is in serious danger of expressing judgments which easily become distorted in the impression they make, or, even if truthfully reported and interpreted, may awaken condemnation of the one delivering them. Often he

speaks with his tongue, while the fiery emotion is burning, not having given himself up to proper musing.

Strong men are perhaps more liable to the peril than weak men. For, the restraining power of will is not increased in the same degree as is the expulsive and explosive power of emotion. Apparently Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, the founder and the first president of Robert College, a man of diverse abilities, was subject to fits of passion. Dr. Pantaretoff, the minister of Bulgaria at Washington, and for a time professor in Robert College, tells me that Dr. Hamlin once told a sick student, and who was sick because he had disobeyed the orders of Dr. Hamlin, "to stay in his bed and die like a dog." In ten minutes, however, Hamlin returned, bearing medicines. A professor in a great law school has described to me the president of the school, and of the university of which the school was and is a part, walking out of a faculty meeting in which action which he opposed had been taken, apparently in a fit of madness. Even a president, of will strong and disposition calm, may at times be thus overwhelmed.

There are at least three dangers to which the president is supposed to be especially subjected, but from which he is as a fact usually free. This freedom, however, is found in the vigor of his subjective force. One of these perils is the peril of silence in the face of public discussion of critical questions. The citizens of a democracy look to a president for the con-

sideration of such questions. For many people in a democracy, at the time of an emergency, are insane in their interpretations of evidences, superficial in their thinking, vociferous in the boldness of their declarations, and small in the pettiness of their dissensions. Some presidents feel the hot breath of debate, and may yield to momentary passions. Yet the great majority keep their heads, and hold their tongues. They recall Emerson's counsel about the "little man." However mistaken his judgment, Andrews, at the time of the silver money controversy of 1896, did not yield to public or academic pressure. The president can well afford to be *contra mundum,* whenever the *mundus* is against him, and if he is in the right.

A second danger which is more frequently manifest, but from which the president is quite as free as from political pressure, is his supposed danger of truckling to wealth. Such truckling, it is inferred, is done in order to secure endowment and funds for buildings. A few presidents have given evidence of the real basis of the charge, but they are few. Among the instances popularly supposed as supporting the charge would be President Harper of Chicago and his relation to Mr. Rockefeller. But anyone who knew Harper, or who knows Mr. Rockefeller, recognizes the baselessness of the indictment. Such presumed subserviency defeats its very purpose. Presidents sometimes give evidence of being obsequious, but they are not servile.

The reason of the current belief and of the frequent remark has its basis in the fact that rich men are found as members of the boards of trust of the colleges. These rich men, too, are not infrequently the most conspicuous members. If one turns to the list of members of the boards of many historic or new colleges, the interpretation finds illustration, and evidence which leads to, without, however, necessitating, the conclusion.

A similar condition is found among the trustees of the great philanthropic and academic foundations. The half dozen of these foundations, which are the more conspicuous, bear the name of either Rockefeller or Carnegie. These foundations hold intimate relations to many colleges and to many causes with which colleges are intimately associated. Hence arises inevitably the belief that these foundations are directed by the rich. But it may be at once added that the administration of these trusts, holding hundreds of millions of dollars, is devoted to the aid of scholars. If Mr. Rockefeller founded and endowed the General Education Board, he has called to be his associates, in the majority of the members, men who are not rich. If Mr. Carnegie laid the Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, he chose for the administration of this fund, largely college presidents.

There are, as I have said, rich men—and some of them very rich,—sitting on the boards of trust of American colleges and universities. Why should they be there? That is the central question, and one com-

pelling an answer. To that question, I wish to make a fourfold reply.

The first reply is that rich men, as a class, are good judges of financial values. If they were poor judges, they would not have become rich men, or, if once they had become rich men, they would not have stayed so. For riches have a way, unless properly chained, of flying away. Riches, like a growing boy, demand constant discrimination in mind, and a firm forcefulness in choice. Now the college has, and must have, an endowment. The endowment signifies proper investment. The form of investment which endowment should take represents constant, delicate, and most difficult work. The investment of such trust funds requires all the best qualities which are supposed to be possessed by the directors of a savings bank, or by rich men who have their own fortunes to preserve or to increase. Therefore, for the securing of proper revenue from proper investments of endowments, it is fitting for rich men to be found on college boards.

A second answer lies in the fact that rich men are able to contribute to the funds of the college. The college does demand, and can use well, great revenues. Such revenues should be derived both from a large number of small givers and a small number of large givers. From rich men, members of the board, knowing the needs of a college, alert to its necessary economies,—efficient economies indeed,—touched with a vision of the deep and enduring usefulness of a

college, may reasonably be expected large gifts. This reasonable expectation is sometimes fated to disappointment, but is more often realized, and frequently more than realized.

A third reply is a negative one, or possibly does not indicate a reason or cause at all,—only the pointing out of a condition. But, whether condition or cause, the fact is that, as a class, the body of rich men contains as many morally good members and upright citizens as are found in a college body of poor men. Neither riches nor poverty, as such, makes either good men or bad, any more than riches or poverty makes happiness. It would be absurd, of course, to say, as some indeed do say, that all rich men are scoundrels, or that only scoundrels can become rich. Some rich men are, indeed, scoundrels, and some scoundrels are rich men, but not for long, in either case. Rich men are, as a class, honest, just as honest—and this is the point—as poor men. They should stand an even chance with all other candidates with respect to becoming members of academic boards of trust.

The fourth reply, and the last reason I shall point out for the membership of rich men, is found in the fact that rich men, as a body, command the respect of their fellow citizens of the community. Of course, there are exceptions, but the remark applied to the class is true. Now, such respect is a precious asset of the college. Such respect calls out the allegiance of all citizens. Such respect makes the office of the

professor more commanding. Such respect helps to win students. Such respect serves to draw forth gifts, and helps to write favoring bequests.

To the acknowledged fact of the membership of rich men on academic boards, and of the fourfold interpretation of the reasons for such membership, I now wish to add a statement yet more important and formative, and for which what I already have written prepares the way. It is the fact that rich men, as a class, do not seek to dominate the affairs of the college of which they are trustees. Of course, exceptions are to be found. But I wish to make a general and firm statement, after dealing with hundreds of trustees for a generation, and after an acquaintance with the members of boards of hundreds of colleges and universities.

In the first place, rich men do not seek to usurp the functions of the body of trustees of which they are members: for they know they are equals in a company of equals. Their judgments are to be taken for what their judgments are worth, neither more nor less. If they are financiers, their opinions count especially on matters financial. If they are manufacturers, their opinions count especially in certain public relations of the colleges. If they are lawyers, their opinions count especially in certain constitutional or legal relationships. Riches as riches do not count. Money does not, in this case, talk.

Neither do rich men seek to dominate the opinions or the teachings of the members of the faculty. They

know, these rich men, that they are not scholars, and they know, therefore, that they should not meddle in affairs scholarly or scholastic. Each to his own, is the recognized rule. Rich men, therefore, as rich men, do not try to rule the college of which they are trustees, or to domineer over the president. The peril of his servility is far less potent than is commonly believed. Trustees, rich in both wisdom and securities, are eager to free him from such a subserviency, and he, rich in wisdom, is usually, though not always, free from the peril.

Yet from another peril, which the president is supposed to be obliged to meet, he is also usually free. It is the peril of yielding to the pressure of athletic interests. This danger arises immediately from the desire to win football, or other games; and, fundamentally, it springs from his, or his associates, (including both graduates and students) forgetting the primary purpose of the college. To win games, elevens may in part be made up of players who are not genuine students. Students, too, though properly enrolled, are sometimes allowed to play despite low scholastic rank, and contrary to accepted rules. I know presidents who, apparently at times, have thus suffered themselves to be abused and abased. But frankness and honesty have usually prevailed in the office of both president, dean, and faculty secretary. President Johnston of Geneva College, Pennsylvania, for instance, was reported as having offered his resignation at the Commencement of 1923, because of

athletic antagonisms. But the resignation was based upon other grounds, far more fundamental.

These three classes of perils, athletic, truckling to wealth, hasty speaking, are, be it again added, far less common and virulent than is supposed.

Among the dangers of a president, also, is one of a wholly different type, which inheres in his relation to founders, to founders' families, and to great benefactors. The peril of wrong relation is not infrequently present, and seems to linger, at least subconsciously, in the heart of many a president. It arises quite as much from the founder himself as from the president.

For what are the characteristics of a good founder or of a great benefactor?

A good founder has imagination and vision. He sees the needs, educational or other, to be filled. He seeks to learn the causes and the conditions of the diverse needs. He relates a particular need to other human necessities. He tries to understand his power, and to appreciate his duty, for filling needs. Such was the mind of at least three great founders, two of whom, however, laid their foundations through their wills,—Johns Hopkins and Sophia Smith. The third, Matthew Vassar, before deciding to establish a college for women, considered several plans for the use of his fortune. He declared that, one after another, he had discarded all.[165] A simple reading of the beginnings of the colleges of Oxford and

[165] Life and Letters of John Howard Raymond. Edited by his eldest daughter. p. 500.

Cambridge proves that those pious founders possessed imagination. The frequency of the imperative character of the epithet "ecclesiastical" or "religious," as applied to their foundations, does not at all lessen the worth of the vision which they saw, or of the wisdom which they used in laying their foundations.

A second mark of a wise founder is provision for an endowment of an amount sufficient, not only to meet the demands of immediate plans, but also to provide for future contingencies. At this point many founders fail. They are prone to interpret the future in the terms of the present: they do not appreciate the fact of growth, and of the consequent increase of needs. They do not anticipate the social changes of a long future. In wisdom, as well as in kindness, the first president of Vassar College wrote to Matthew Vassar, even before the college was opened, saying:

"In the generosity of the man who has laid so broad and deep the foundation of this enterprise, and of other gentlemen who are equally interested with him in the fame of the honored name it bears, the College has everything to hope for, nothing to speculate upon. And I believe the best warrant for the expectation of further liberality will be the prudent management of that already bestowed. In this connection, I for one have heartily regretted, and still do, that the munificent sum consecrated by you, sir, three years ago to this sacred cause should, to so large an extent, have been absorbed in mere material provisions, compelling us to begin the ungra-

cious work of retrenchment and enforced economy just as we reach the vital part—the men and women who are to infuse their spirit into its life, and to put upon the College for all time to come the impress of their heart and brain—in other words, compelling us after the old fashion *to pinch and starve the College at its heart.*"[166]

A founder, too, whether giving amply or niggardly, for the present or for the future, is never to permit himself to hold out intimations of larger amounts, either by gift or bequest, than he is certain of bestowing. Neither should he suffer himself to be reticent in regard to his plans, in case a board has any right to know his intentions. For years, Jonas Gilman Clark, of Clark University, caused his trustees much suffering by his silence. President Hall says of him:

"I take some though only partial satisfaction in the fact that Mr. Clark, however serious his frequent threats were of going elsewhere with what remained of his fortune, never carried them out but in the end almost everything he possessed, including his residence and even furniture, came to us. This great fear of us all seemed later to have been unshaken. . . . During the third year he had entirely withdrawn from the board and never afterward attended its meetings, and felt a strong and growing censure for its members which was entirely unjustified because his course had thrown upon them an exceptionally

[166] *Ibid.*, p. 511.

heavy burden which they took up and maintained with singular fidelity to what they believed to be his highest purpose."[167]

A still further mark of a good founder lies in his having full confidence in, and giving full power to, his legal associates. He is to choose, if his be the function to choose, the best associates, and then he is to give to them his full trustfulness, in respect both to their judgment and to their subsequent and consequent legislative and administrative faithfulness. Many conspicuous instances of the giving of such trustfulness might be noted. There are also a few, hardly less interesting, of the lack of such confidence.

Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller illustrate well the bestowal of such trustfulness in the laying of the academic, and other, foundations which bear their names. They each selected the wisest men as their trustees, and then they gave them, as they ought, their trust. Mr. Carnegie knew, as Mr. Rockefeller knows, that he was not an expert in university or college administration. They both gave greatly of their great fortunes, and gave with a willingness absolutely unique, to the laying of foundations. While they appreciated founders' duties, they also recognized the rights of trustees and of teachers. Their mood was never one of the imposition of duties, but rather of gratitude to trustees for accepting and

[167] Life and Confessions of a Psychologist. By G. Stanley Hall. pp. 298-299.

for administering endowments. They kept their own hands off. Often have I heard Mr. Carnegie assure the trustees of his most academic foundation, of his deep appreciation of their services. Mr. Vassar's mood, manifest in his last words, words which were written by him, but never spoken, are an intimation of the wise method:

"Wishing you, gentlemen, a continuance of health and happiness, I bid you a cordial and final farewell. Thanking you kindly for your official attentions and services, and not expecting, from my advanced years and increasing infirmities, to meet with you officially again, I implore the Divine Goodness to guide and direct you aright in all your councils."[168]

In the case of another great founder, or founders, the Stanfords, the conditions were, in the first years of the university, unique. It was understood and accepted that Senator Stanford, or Mrs. Stanford, formed essentially the whole body of the trustees as a directing and controlling force: "The new institution was to be 'personally conducted,' its sole trustee a business man who was, moreover, active in political life."[169] Of Mrs. Stanford, President Jordan says: "Her salient personal trait, that of absolute loyalty to every plan of her husband, was of paramount value to us through the twelve years in which the university

[168] Life and Letters of John Howard Raymond. Edited by his eldest daughter. p. 651.

[169] The Days of a Man. By David Starr Jordan. Vol. I, p. 355.

and its future rested absolutely in her hands. Had she yielded or flinched in any one of a dozen crises or embarrassments, the endowment would have been wrecked.''[170] Under such conditions of storm, President Jordan proved to be a wise pilot and brought the university into the desired haven. As I have said, such a condition is unique.

A further mark of a wise and good founder is found in the real affection which he has for his associates, and which, in turn, quickens a like affection on their part for him. Such a feeling Sophia Smith had for Dr. John M. Greene. Such a feeling, too, moved in the heart of the first president of Sophia Smith's college, and was reciprocated in the hearts of all his co-workers. Such a feeling moved Matthew Vassar. In the year 1864, President Raymond wrote:

''For the first time I have been brought into direct contact with Mr. Vassar's heart; it is as large as an elephant's and as tender as a babe's. We talked over the whole enterprise, and all that he aimed at, and how he aimed to accomplish it. Our views harmonized at every point. It is a wonder to me how a man without any regular education can so correctly appreciate the necessities of such an institution and the conditions of its success. But it is the purity of his motives, and the large and generous catholicity of his spirit, in combination with a broad common sense and much business experience, that explains it. 'If

[170] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 157.

thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.' '' [171]

Yet another peril of the president, and it is the last to which I shall allude, is that of not knowing when his work is done, and that consequently the time has come for him to lay down his office. That peril may be constituted by the very success of his service. By the power of its earlier years he is blinded to the later weaknesses and failures of his administration. He may be also blinded by the new occasions which should, but do not, reveal to him new duties. He fails to recognize the changes in public and academic conditions. He should not indeed fail to recognize the changes. For, he is a sort of British prime minister; and when his constituency goes against him, he has only one alternative. Lord Morley, in his ''Life of Gladstone,'' referring to the constant toil and industry of the great man, says:

''Who can wonder that after a prolonged spell of such a strain as this, he was found laying down strong doctrine about the age of a prime minister? Bishop Wilberforce met him twice in the May of 1873. 'Gladstone much talking how little real good work any premier had done after sixty: Peal; Palmerston, his work really all done before; Duke of Wellington added nothing to his reputation after. I told him Dr. Clark thought it would be physically worse for him to retire. ''Dr. Clark does not know how completely I should employ myself,'' he replied.'

[171] Life and Letters of John Howard Raymond. p. 513.

Four days later: 'Gladstone again talking of sixty as full age of premier.' "[172]

The peril of the president not knowing when his work is done is also based on the adulations of friends who are inclined to emphasize the importance of his continuing to the permanent welfare of the college.[173] It is well for the president to take office

[172] The Life of William Ewart Gladstone. By John Morley. Vol. II, p. 423.

[173] In his "Life of Alice Freeman Palmer," writing of her retirement from the presidency of Wellesley, at the time of their approaching marriage, Professor Palmer says:

"In the view of both of us Miss Freeman's work at Wellesley was already substantially done. In another six years she could accomplish little more than any creditable successor. She had set the pattern, and quiet growth according to it was what was now required. Little further constructive work was at the moment possible. From the dying hands of the founder she had received the rough outlines of a college. With consummate skill and originality she had set these in order, and filled them with such ideals as would insure their ultimate strength. But she was confined to a pioneer epoch, and its very conditions cut her off from sharing in the anticipated results. No college can be created at a word; it is a thing of growth. Especially is it true of a college started by a single founder that after its first active years there comes a considerable period of quiescence. Until the personal stamp has worn away, the public rightly will not adopt it. The Trustees selected by the founder must die, his Faculty be replaced, the resources of his fortune prove evidently insufficient, his private methods of administration go through a searching criticism, and he himself sink into a hazy and mythical figure, before the community will regard his college as really its own and a new group of givers be gathered for its support. All this requires time. It seemed to Miss

when he is young in years, but mature in judgment. It is quite as well for him to retire, whatever his years, if life or labor put heaviness upon his spirit. The following instances are representative of lengths of service and of the age of retirement of a score or more of presidents. They are selected from a great and wide field, both in time and type of institution. For this very reason they are the more representative. Leonard Woods retired from Bowdoin in 1866, at the age of fifty-nine, after a service of twenty-seven years. Julius H. Seelye retired from the presidency of Amherst in 1890, at the age of sixty-six, after a service of twenty-five years. Samuel Colcord Bartlett retired from the presidency of Dartmouth in 1892, at the age of seventy-five, after a service of fifteen years. Arthur T. Hadley retired from the presidency of Yale in 1921, at the age of sixty-five, after a service of twenty-two years. Benjamin Ide Wheeler retired from the presidency of the University of California in 1919, at the age of sixty-five, after a service of twenty years. Frederick A. P. Barnard, however, did not retire from the presi-

Freeman and myself that having faithfully carried the college through its pioneer period, she might be discharged from its waiting time; that the length of this might even be diminished and the coming of a period of expansion be hastened by the withdrawal of one so closely associated with its founder. Much of the aid she could now give might be given as well in private life as from the president's chair. Of course she remained on the Board of Trustees, and was a close friend of the succeeding presidents." pp. 174-175.

dency of Columbia, but remained in the office until his death in 1889, at the age of eighty, after a service of twenty-five years. Franklin Carter retired from the presidency of Williams in 1901, at the age of sixty-four, after a service of twenty years. James Monroe Taylor retired from Vassar in 1914, at the age of sixty-six, after a service of twenty-eight years. Thomas Hill retired from the presidency of Harvard in 1868, at the age of fifty, after a service of six years. L. Clark Seelye retired from the presidency of Smith in 1910, at the age of seventy-three, after a service of thirty-seven years. Asa Dodge Smith retired from the presidency of Dartmouth in 1877, at the age of seventy-three, after a service of fourteen years. William G. Ballantine retired from the presidency of Oberlin in 1906, at the age of fifty-eight, after a service of fifteen years. James W. Bashford retired from the presidency of Ohio Wesleyan in 1904, at the age of fifty-five, after a service of fifteen years; and Herbert Welch retired from the presidency of the same university in 1916, at the age of fifty-four, after a service of eleven years. James H. Canfield retired from the presidency of Ohio State in 1899, at the age of fifty-two, after a service of four years. John Maclean retired from the presidency of Princeton in 1868, at the age of sixty-eight, after a service of fourteen years. George Harris retired from the presidency of Amherst in 1911, at the age of sixty-seven, after a service of twelve years. George Edwin MacLean retired from the presidency of Iowa State

in 1911, at the age of sixty-one, after a service of twelve years. Frank Strong retired from the University of Kansas in 1920, at the age also of sixty-one, after a service of eighteen years. Charles W. Dabney, after sixteen years of service, retired from the presidency of the University of Cincinnati at the age of sixty-five. Richard H. Jesse retired from the University of Missouri in 1908, at the age of fifty-five, after a service of seventeen years. William H. Demarest retired from the presidency of Rutgers in 1923, at the age of sixty, after a service of seventeen years.

Several of these presidents, especially the younger, upon their retirement, took up other work,—Canfield, for instance, of a librarian, and Bashford and Welch of a bishop. Several resumed an earlier calling, either teaching or the ministry.

One of the most efficient of all presidents of Harvard College was Josiah Quincy, to whom was given the insight to retire after sixteen years of noble service, at the age of seventy-three. President John Quincy Adams wrote to him, near the time of his retirement:

"I have never said to you, Mr. Quincy, how much I approved your resigning your Presidency of Harvard College under the circumstances in which you were,—in full health and success, and with every indication of the power of protracted usefulness,—out of regard to your advanced period of life, and solely from a wish to have what remained to you of

it at your own command, unembarrassed by official obligations. I consider that act as the crowning glory of your life, and characteristic of great wisdom."[174]

The great McCosh, too, says of his retirement:

"I am reminded keenly that my days of active work are over. But I take the step firmly and decidedly. The shadows are lengthening, the day is declining. My age, seven years above the three score and ten, compels it, Providence points to it, conscience enjoins it, the good of the college demands it. I take the step as one of duty. I feel relieved as I take it."[175]

In quite a different field, Daniel Bliss, president at Beirut, always said that he would resign at the age of seventy. His seventieth year found him so full of vigor that no talk of resignation was allowed. It is declared that the idea appeared to his colleagues to be almost amusing. He served for ten years longer, until his eightieth year. But such a prolongation is to most presidents full of danger.[176]

At the age of fifty-one, Pepper of Pennsylvania wrote:

"It is a hard thing for one whose heart is in a large task to decide the moment when it is wise to hand over to another the charge of leadership confided to him. If the work is prospering, so many motives seem

[174] Life of Josiah Quincy. By Edmund Quincy. p. 491.

[175] The Life of James McCosh. Edited by William Milligan Sloane. p. 239.

[176] Reminiscences of Daniel Bliss. p. 214.

to prompt even a longer delay. When I accepted the call to be Provost of the University I promised my family that I would hold the position only for three or at the outside for five years. One important question has arisen after another; complications have developed which needed adjustment. One cannot leave a post of trust unless all is prosperous; one shrinks from abdicating when it has become a position of assured honor and power. Since I resolved to resign the Provostship I found myself assailed by disquieting suggestions from within; but there was not one of them which, in the last analysis, was other than some expression of vanity.'' [177] A sacrifice ''to the public welfare,'' [178] Pepper died at the age of fifty-four.

What Delane said of the public and of himself, at the age of sixty-one, and after serving thirty-seven years as editor of *The Times,* might be called a worthy *nunc dimittis* of an American college president: '' 'The public,' he wrote to one of his old colleagues, 'so far as it takes any interest in my fate, will see that I have not belied my destiny, but that I worked on as long as I could and only struck work when there was no longer the power of working.' '' [179]

In this general peril touching retirement are in-

[177] The Life of William Pepper, M.D., LL.D. By Francis Newton Thorpe. p. 353.

[178] *Ibid.,* p. 453.

[179] John Thadeus Delane, Editor of *The Times.* His Life and Correspondence. By Arthur Irwin Dasent. Vol. II. p. 339.

cluded the elements of technical details united with the primary element of the withdrawal itself. These elements are frequently hard to adjust. The difficulty, of course, increases with the strength of the willingness or of the positive desire of members of governing boards for the president's withdrawal. In making the separation, under such circumstances, peculiar carefulness is necessary. The circumstances should not be those which attended the retirement of Cyrus Hamlin from the presidency of Robert College of Constantinople. In the course of an interview, Dr. Hamlin relates that, after a short painful silence, Mr. Robert said: "Dr. Hamlin, it has been thought best that you should not return to Constantinople!" Dr. Hamlin interprets his own feeling by saying: "I saw instantly that my seventeen years of connection with Mr. Robert had come to an end. A 'horror of great darkness' fell upon me momentarily. In such experiences the mind acts with inconceivable rapidity and does the work of hours in a moment. I resolved to ask for no explanation and to make no defense of my course, nor of my rights. I bowed my head in silent prayer for perfect self-control; then I rose and said: 'I suppose we separate now, Mr. Robert,' and offered him my hand. He took my hand and burst into tears."[180] Such conditions in essence are not unique, yet the far more normal condition is for boards of trustees to give to a retiring president every possible consideration, both personal and official, of

[180] My Life and Times. By Cyrus Hamlin. pp. 503-504.

affection and of gratitude. The fact of the inevitableness of retirement is no excuse for inconsiderateness in either form or method.

Yet as the president thinks of his past tenure, it having been either long or short, one special sentiment should move in his heart and in his mind. He should be willing to be forgotten. Of course, he will not be forgotten, but the willingness, notwithstanding, should possess him. For his personal presence will inevitably pass into a personal remembrance, and the personal remembrance will quite as inevitably become a remembrance impersonal and official. He, therefore, should be content, and, be it added, many presidents are great enough to be content.

But before his formal and absolute withdrawal, a still further duty and pleasure remain for the acceptance of the retiring president. The duty and pleasure lie in his making a fitting preparation for the coming of his successor. For his term is not to be regarded as single or exceptional. It does not stand as a solitary unit. He has been himself a successor, and to him there is also to be a successor. Officers come and go, but the office goes on. In such preparation he is, negatively, not to give counsel, unless it be asked for, and most of all not to offer criticism, and yet still further not to be willing to embarrass his successor by any act in order to elevate the worth or to obscure the weakness of his own administration. Positively, he is to rejoice, and to show his rejoicing, in his successor. He is to give approval

so far as possible to the measures and policies of his successor, and ever to point out and to emphasize the excellencies of these policies. He is to be sympathetic without effusiveness, helpful without meddlesomeness, coöperative without condescension, quickening in dark hours to the man who follows him, and the first to offer sincere congratulations in the bright days, and above all most happy when his successor brings to noble conclusion and full consummation plans which he himself had laid and was not able to execute.

## CHAPTER V

### REWARDS

The rewards of a college president are, in many respects, not unlike those which belong to all who labor directly to serve men. His rewards, too, are peculiarly akin to those which the minister or the teacher receives. Certain rewards of the teacher, or of the minister, however, especially those of a personal nature, do not, and perhaps even cannot, belong to him in an equal degree.

The rewards that are given to the president may be easily divided into at least two classes. The division, however, is not close, elements of each class belonging to the other. One class is made up of elements peculiarly personal, and the other class of elements that relate largely to the associations formed, to the appreciations given, to the environment made, and to the public results won by his students in their subsequent life.

In the rewards of the first group, of a personal type, are several of much worth.

The president has the satisfaction of knowing that he has filled an office which calls for qualities of manhood, broadest in relationships, deepest in realities, highest in purpose and vision. The constant and

urgent demand for these qualities has indeed tended to create and to nourish them in himself. The service, which he has tried to render, should add ability to his intellect, generosity to his spirit, and graciousness to his manner. The greatness of the office helps to make him great. The essence of the remark which a man—chosen professor of Greek in an historic college—made, can be applied to the president: "I now will make myself a scholar."

This personal feeling is closely allied with the feeling that he has tried to fill an office, however unworthily he may have filled it, which demands and receives public respect. His is a place of elevation, of honor, of distinction. He has enrolled himself with those who belong to the order of merit. Of course, with this feeling is woven the feeling of humility. He recognizes that it is not himself who has won such nobility of place: it is the favor of friends, the happiness of conditions, the grace of the divine. In his gratitude, he knows he has sufficient, and more than sufficient, reason to be exceedingly humble. Others may praise him for what he has done. He alone knows what he wanted to do and was not able. Of Thring of Uppingham, on the celebration of an anniversary, one of his boys wrote, near the close of his great career: "As the little man who created and saved the present Uppingham sat in state, surrounded by bishops and noblemen who paid homage to his marvelous work, memory was busy within me, with varying emotion, as it recalled the small begin-

nings, the early struggles, the never-failing strong faith, the manly persistent effort, the fiery trial, the final great triumph.''[181] A similar spirit moves in the soul of, and a similar atmosphere surrounds, many a college president on his later anniversary days.

The president has also cause for rewarding gratitude in the interpretation that his office represents what I may call a sense of the co-working of his own personal powers. The different parts or functions of his being act and re-act on each other unto richest happiness in the result. The intellect qualifies and clarifies the feelings. The feelings, in turn, quicken the intellectual power, giving vigor to the intellectual process. The emotions, too, strengthen the will. The will, in its place, kindles vigor in the intellect, creates substance for the feeling, insuring just proportion of faculties, and balance of functions. The various parts of his nature coöperate in forming a character which is a worthy union of happiness, of efficiency, and of completeness. The proportion of personal powers which Aristotle in the ''Politics'' emphasizes, as properly belonging to worthy rulers of the state, should be incarnated in his character.

The president also may be assured that he has made a multitude of warm and enduring friendships to which no personal interpretation can give a just valuation. These friendships cover the globe. His boys and his girls encircle the earth. They once were

[181] Edward Thring: Headmaster of Uppingham School. By George R. Parkin. Vol. II. p. 153.

young, as he was. They now are old, as he is. But they are still his boys and his girls. Mark Hopkins was president of a small college, hidden amid the Berkshires; but he was a teacher in the American Board Colleges of Asia Minor, his books were texts in the schools of China and of Japan, and his presence was felt in hundreds of homes and of lecture-rooms around the world. They,—these boys and girls,—in turn, love the president, for in them he lives. There is formed between them the parental and the filial union. The relation is pastoral as well as domestic. What were and are the friendships of Northrop of Minnesota, of Angell of Michigan, of Andrews of Brown, of Tucker of Dartmouth! To go far afield, what hosts of Scottish students all over the world admired and loved Tullock of the little gray town! These friendships bless both the giver and the receiver, and each is both a receiver and a giver.

Closely associated with the reward of friendship and of love is the consciousness that he,—this president,—is privileged to live his life, and to do his work with the best people, to associate with the best people and under the best conditions, who, in the association, reveal and use the best powers of their best character. The most interesting citizens of the world are his daily companions. Such reward has priceless meanings for the devout, aspiring, and responsive soul. At the inauguration of Bayard Dodge, as president of the American University at Beirut, Dr. Frank P. Graves, the president of the University

of the State of New York, and State Commissioner of Education, referred in fitting phrase to this type of reward:

"You will have the opportunity of associating with the scholars and high-minded members of your faculty and board of trustees. . . . You will ever have about you the vitality and hopefulness of your students, and, until one has lost the opportunity of living with youth, he little realizes the joy and inspiration of it all. You will have the privilege of meeting the best men and women of the community at their best, for these superlatives are needed to describe those who will talk with you about their children or pupils at the university. You will live in the atmosphere of the world's greatest minds, present and past."[182] The most interesting subjects of conversation form the basis of mutual talk of the president's office. Parents, too, come to him to confer about the education of children. Students come to him to talk over their most intimate problems of to-day and of the long to-morrow. Professors come to him to confer about their classes, their subjects, their methods of teaching, and the perplexities created by their individual students. Public officers come to him to learn his interpretations of public duty, governors of commonwealths and presidents of great re-

[182] Address at the Inauguration of the President of the American University of Beirut. By Frank Pierrepont Graves. School and Society. Vol. XVIII, No. 455, September 15, 1923. p. 304.

publics summon him to sit at their council tables. Professors from New Zealand and Australia, scholars from China, ministers of education of many states, meet and mingle in his office.[183]

Not only with the best, but also with all sorts and races of men does he associate. With the merchants and manufacturers, he is a man of business; with the banker, a counselor; with the editor, an interpreter; with each, a co-knower, or a co-worker. Nothing which is human is foreign to him. He unites the individual and the community, the village and the world, in his mind and heart.

The diversities of these world relationships are well intimated in the variety of callers which a typical college president receives. His biographer speaks of the "ceaseless procession" which came into the office of President Walker of the Institute of Technology. He says:

"This stream might be made up, for example, of a member of the Faculty seeking advice about some new departure, a newspaper man to get his views on a

[183] "Many other eminent visitors might be named, among them Chinese and Japanese ambassadors, foreign missionaries, University Presidents, Mr. Justice Miller and Mr. Justice Harlan of the United States Supreme Court, Secretary Bayard, Mr. Roosevelt, when Governor of New York, Sir Frederick Pollock, and Charles A. Dana, editor of the New York *Sun*. These names may suffice to illustrate how stimulating the life of a University and especially the life of the President's home are made by the guests who come to lend inspiration to the Institution."—Reminiscences of James Burrill Angell. p. 254.

recent piece of legislation, a janitor reporting on the making of some repairs as economically as possible, a senator from Washington paying a friendly call, a weeping mother praying for advice about her dismissed son, a member of the Corporation considering arguments to be used with some wealthy 'prospect,' a freshman stammering excuses for past misdemeanors, a professional Boston reformer begging the backing of his powerful name, an eminent economist from abroad expounding some new theory in a marvelous attempt at English." [184]

In a personal way, too, the president feels a sense of reward on the material or financial side. His purse is never full, but also it is never empty. He suffers neither poverty nor wealth. He has means enough to care for his family, but both to himself and to the family his salary and his annuity are only means, never ends. His years of gratitude for abundance far outnumber the months of anxiety for paying increasing bills. His children go forth from the best of homes in which each is taught the lesson of economy, of self-help, of the obligation of present duty, of the blessedness of the rewards of service. There are, of course, presidents—be it confessed—who feel they lack reward. The fist two presidents of our oldest college spent years, following their retirement from office, painfully conscious of physical needs unfilled, and of personal service unrecognized. Many

[184] A Life of Francis Amasa Walker. By James Phinney Munroe. p. 371.

successors have they had in the last two hundred and fifty and more years. Though some presidents have fallen on evil days, yet the few stand apart from many happy companions of the long pilgrimage, the many who have neither poverty nor riches, who neither suffer undue depression nor are too far lifted by skyey exultations.

Among the rewards of the class that seem somewhat less personal are found many which, even in their more public relations, do yet partake of the personal type.

Of such rewards, the first which I name is the sense of having aided students somewhat unto the possession of the priceless gift of being a thinker. Being able to think is the richest intellectual result of the college. To think also represents thinking truthfully. It means reasoning upon realities. It implies understanding. The process and the result make up a recompense belonging especially to the teacher. But the president has a right to share in it so far as he is a teacher himself, or so far as he seeks to give aid and guidance to his teaching colleagues. As his first duty, his first privilege, and his first service, lie in the field of thinking, so also does his reward. Maitland, called the finest legal mind in England since Blackstone, said about Henry Sidgwick:

"There was the sympathetic and kindly endeavour to overcome our shyness, to make us talk, and to make us think. . . . The freest and boldest thinking was set forth in words which seemed to carry candour

and sobriety and circumspection to their furthest limit."[185] Sidgwick realized the reward which belongs to the college president. A similar interpretation many a college boy could give of his president,—the Amherst graduate of Seelye's presidency, the Bowdoin graduate of Hyde's formative administration. Such, be it added, was the type of reward which Garman enjoyed in aiding the men of Amherst whom he loved, and whose love for him endured, and endures.

Intimately linked with the intellectual reward is the ethical and religious. The president may, or may not, teach ethics, or theology, or the Bible, as he frequently taught in the former time. He yet has lived and incarnated the cardinal virtues. He has embodied, or at least sought to embody, justice. He has practiced temperance in all things. He has shown charity. He has represented and exercised patience. He has the consciousness that he has sought, however, inadequately, to obey the Ten Commandments and to give heed to the Beatitudes. He has been a Christian disciple, and his discipleship he has made an apostleship of righteousness. Of many a college president it may be said, as a graduate of Hamilton, of the class of '75, said of "Old Greek," Edward North:

"Your gentleness and kindliness, and evident faith that there was something good in me, kept me

[185] Frederick William Maitland. By H. A. L. Fisher. p. 8.

from going straight to the devil. If I knew where upon this earth I could find a like influence for my boy, I should feel that he would be safe."[186]

Among the rewards of the less personal sort a high place should be given to the consciousness of public service: devoted to the training of leaders of the state, of the church, and of the whole community. What a service Jowett thus rendered to the whole British Empire! The memorial tablet placed on the walls of Balliol is no mean index of British history.[187]

As the American college and university have nourished the great men of America, so the president of the college has given his just contribution to this richest offering. Of Hamilton College it has been said:

"The richest possessions of the institution are the

[186] Old Greek: A Memoir of Edward North. By S. N. D. North. p. 397.

[187] "The following list, though imperfect, of Jowett's more distinguished pupils may be of interest. It is mainly compiled from the Life, by Campbell and Abbott: W. R. Anson, H. H. Asquith, A. C. Bradley, W. St. John Brodrick, L. Campbell, E. Caird, G. N. Curzon, Earl of Elgin, J. A. Godley, A. Grant, T. H. Green, C. B. Heberden, C. P. Ilbert, F. H. Jeune, W. P. Ker, A. Lang, R. Lodge, K. M. Mackenzie, W. H. Mallock, A. Milner, R. B. D. Morier, W. W. Merry, R. L. Nettleship, W. L. Newman, J. Nichol, F. T. Palgrave, A. W. Peel, T. Raleigh, W. G. Rutherford, D. G. Ritchie, W. Y. Sellar, J. C. Shairp, H. Smith, A. Swinburne, J. A. Symonds, A. Toynbee, T. Walrond, W. Wallace, J. C. Wilson, T. H. Warren."—Balliol College. By H. W. Carless Davis. p. 216, footnote.

multitude of lives, past and present, that would never have been educated if the college had not been here; the intelligences that would not have been enlarged by learning and literature; the spirits that would not have been quickened but for her; the unrecorded influences for the betterment of a thousand communities to which her graduates have gone; the part she has played in the development of our country along lines of Christian civilization."[188]

Similar testimony is offered regarding the work of President Francis A. Walker of the Institute of Technology:

"The greatest service that General Walker gave . . . was one of personal influence, mainly through example, upon the lives of thousands of men, most of them younger than he, who came under his teaching or within the radius of his vitalizing personality. Through him they have been enabled, not only to shape their own lives more effectively, but to transmit to others, in ever widening circles, the lessons that they learned and the qualities that they acquired as they sat at Walker's feet."[189] The reward which was thus given to Walker is the reward touching intimate and public personality. It lies, both as cause and result, in one's own being and character. Munroe, his biographer, speaks of it as "a spirit compounded of the essential dignity of

[188] Documentary History of Hamilton College. p. 22.

[189] A Life of Francis Amasa Walker. By James Phinney Munroe. p. VII.

youth, of the blessedness of hard and purposeful labor, of the spiritual strength that comes from working and playing and planning together, of the lasting satisfaction which grows out of mutual give and take, out of bending one's whole energies to making the most of one's self, in order that one may be of the utmost possible service to mankind."[190]

President Eliot has said:

"About the middle of the eighteenth century there appeared a striking change in the product of Harvard College, which turned out to be of the first importance, the beginning, indeed, of the secular functions which have now become its chief object. The College began to produce a considerable proportion of young men who became leaders in business, law, medicine, politics, and society; men who possessed in youth, or acquired later through reading and experience, knowledge, imagination, and enterprise. The names of Samuel Adams, Isaac Hinckley, Edward Winslow, Foster Hutchinson, Samuel Cooper, James Otis, Thomas Cushing, James Bowdoin, Thomas Bullfinch, Edward Augustus Holyoke, Samuel Moody, William Ellery, Ebenezer Storer, Artemas Ward, Robert Treat Paine, and Oliver Prescott, all of whom graduated between 1740 and 1750, illustrate this function of Harvard College."[191]

In such a possession and in such a contribution to human betterment, the president shares. This result

[190] *Ibid.*, p. 413.

[191] Harvard Memories. By Charles W. Eliot. pp. 44-45.

in the training of leaders has a certain origin in yet another reward, namely, in the transmuting of wealth from personal, individual ownership to communal and to college possession. Personal, individual property is one of the best results of the movement of civilization. Personal, individual property is, in the course of generations, to become either wasted or to be transferred to other individual ownership. Property given to a college becomes a lasting public treasure, and not only a lasting public treasure, but also a treasure consecrated to highest uses. Funds given to a well-established American college are the most secure of all investments. No trust is so sure of execution in the year of our Lord, 3925, as the fund given to-day to a good college. The financial history of Harvard College, for almost three hundred years, of Yale College, for more than two hundred years, gives evidence of the soundness of this interpretation. The beneficence, too, of a trust thus made, partakes of all the good will of the college itself. For a president to be able to say that he has been the agent of adding millions to the endowment of his university, should give to him a durable satisfaction, a satisfaction of the kind which Alexander Hamilton felt over the stabilization of the American currency in his term as Secretary of the Treasury. Even if he have not added millions to the endowment, he may yet have the satisfaction of knowing that perhaps he has saved his university from financial ruin in its times of critical dependence. It is said

of Witherspoon of Princeton, in the years of the Revolutionary War, and in the years preceding, that he, "undismayed, resolute, resourceful and energetic," brought the college into so sound a "financial condition that it never again faced such a crisis." "By his personal self-sacrifices of money, his patience in waiting for his own salary sometimes two or three years in arrears, by faithfully performing that most disagreeable duty of soliciting money from private individuals often strangers to himself, and whose respect and admiration he won, 'by journeyings often,' never uttering a word of complaint or giving a sign of discouragement, this stranger in a strange land, practically saved the college from threatened bankruptcy, and in spite of war and financial depression in the land made it financially one of the strongest institutions in America."[192] Such a reward takes on a certain institutional relationship. To be the founder of an enduring institution represents one of the most precious of all privileges. Bacon so indicated, and, for more than three hundred years, the judgment and sentiment of the great philosopher have filled many a bosom. For the president is a founder. Such was Wheelock of Dartmouth, Gilman of Johns Hopkins, White of Cornell, Seelye of Smith, and Raymond of Vassar. But institutions once founded are to be refounded every decade. New forces are to be added to the academic

[192] John Witherspoon. By David Walker Woods, Jr. pp. 135-136.

powers, new endowment given to the academic treasure, new personalities installed in the governing boards and teaching staffs, new friends to be created as communal supporters. Such opportunities belong to every president, and in varying degrees. Speaking of the Harvard School of Business Administration, founded in 1908, President Eliot said:

"This School is doing a pioneer work. That is one of the chief joys in working in it and for it. There is no work in this world more satisfactory for the worker than pioneer work in an interesting field. Get all of it you can in your after-lives. Do all the prospecting or pioneering that you can lay your hands on. You'll never get more joyful work than the work of the pioneer, hard and risky as it must often be."[193]

"I hardly think that I had during my life as an educational administrator any greater satisfaction than I have taken in the creation and growth of this School of Business Administration. It has had so very prompt and striking a success."[194]

The "durable satisfaction" which Eliot thus expressed belongs in some degree to every president. He feels that a new star which he has helped to create, or to discover, has swung into the sky; that a

[193] The Graduate School of Business Administration. An address by Charles W. Eliot before the Business School Club. The Harvard Alumni Bulletin, Vol. XXV, March 1, 1923. No. 22. pp. 648-649.

[194] *Ibid.*, p. 652.

new Pacific has been added to the academic world.[195]

[195] "During his thirty-six years in the active Presidency, Dr. Daniel Bliss had seen the evolution of the College [at Beirut] from a group of sixteen students, housed in a few rooms, to a body of six hundred and twenty-six men and boys, divided among five departments: Preparatory, Collegiate, Commercial, Medical and Pharmaceutical; and taught by forty professors and tutors. Over half of these were Americans, the medium of instruction having been entirely changed from Arabic to English when the institution was about seventeen years old. The campus of forty acres spread, then as now, over the level top of a hill, and sloped down toward the sea, almost touching it at one point. It was dotted over with trees, single and in groves: pines, palms, eucalyptus,—olive-trees, fig-trees, pepper-trees. The twelve buildings included the old College Hall with library, lecture-rooms and dormitories; Assembly Hall, Observatory, Medical Hall, Laboratories, etc. The students came from all parts of Syria and Palestine, from the Valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates, from Cyprus and the Isles of Greece, from Asia Minor and Armenia, from Persia and from Brazil. They represented the various Christian sects: Papal, Greek-Orthodox, Armenian, Copt and Protestant, with a few Druses, some Jews and over fifty Mohammedans. As President-Emeritus, Dr. Bliss lived to see a considerable extension of the campus; the doubling of the number of buildings, including three Hospital Pavilions; the addition of a School of Dentistry; the development of a Training School for Nurses; and increase in the student body to almost one thousand, and of the teaching and administrative force to about eighty; a change in the proportion between the members of Christian and non-Christian sects, the latter indeed outnumbering the former soon after his death. The territory from which students were drawn had enlarged; men began to be attracted to the Syrian Protestant College from Russian Tartary, India,

The human side of the grateful stewardship is also not to be hidden. I now refer to the largest relationships of the president. The president, above all, should help the people, and especially the people in large groups, to understand each other. In this age of industrial, political, and social antagonisms, he should be both a revealing and a reconciling factor. In the year 1883, Professor W. G. Sumner, of Yale, wrote a great little book bearing the pregnant title "What Social Classes Owe to Each Other." Its essential answer was that the social classes owe nothing to each other. The two score years that have passed since its issue give evidence that social classes do owe much to each other. The human experiences, individual and social, of the intervening generation, give proof that at least one class, the unprivileged, does feel that another class, which it regards as the privileged, does owe a big debt to humanity.

Between the workings of the industrial groups, between the antagonisms of social, financial, farming, and other groups, the college president should have his place as an informing and adjusting power. He should, above all men, seek to know the truth, and he does use his ability to find the truth. He should be able to disentangle the ele-

Newfoundland, etc. Those from the New World were the sons of Syrian parents who wished their children to remember their mother-tongue."—The Reminiscences of Daniel Bliss. Edited and supplemented by his eldest son. pp. 215-216.

ments of a complex problem, social and industrial. With his ability is joined a sense of justice for the individual and for the community. He has no class to favor, no revenges to satisfy, no passions to indulge. He wants to know, and he desires to declare, truth, with justice and with a sense of the welfare of the whole. Serving in such a condition, he has a keen sense of rewarding happiness. Angell, of Michigan, wrote, near the close of his long and fruitful career:

"It has been a singular good fortune to be allowed to work with so many excellent men in the Board of Regents and in the Faculties and to come in touch with so many students who have gone forth to careers of usefulness in all parts of the world. The life of the President of a college or university is often spoken of as a hard and trying life. A laborious life with its anxieties it is. But I have found it a happy life. The satisfactions it has brought to me are quite beyond my deserts. The recognition of the value of my services which has come to me in these recent days from regents, colleagues, graduates, and undergraduates humbles me while it gratifies me." [196]

Service in such conditions, moreover, points the way to a still further advantage. The president represents the progress of the best human forces, and the fixedness of these forces at a point attained. The human forces move in a very wayward path. Often they seem to become regressive. The progress fol-

[196] The Reminiscences of James Burrill Angell. p. 256.

lows, however, the method of the spiral. As it goes round, it may seem to return upon itself, but it does finally go up, and seldom goes down or backward. The president is a leader in the forward and upward movement. Hundreds of such presidencies it would be easy to name. Draper, of Illinois, has in strong phrases, given a similar judgment, both in its negative and positive relations:

"Of course, no one can realize the hopes which center in a university presidency, without being able to work harmoniously with others. There must be true deference to the opinions of many, and scrupulous recognition of the just, though unexpressed, claims of all. But we must never forget that administrative freedom is quite as inviolable as any other freedom, even in a university. The president must mark out his official course for himself, and bear the responsibility of it without cavil. He must expect to suffer criticism and opposition, even contumely. He cannot expect that the work he has to do will make every one happy. It will discomfit many. In one way or another they will give him all the trouble they can. The protests will be loudest because of the very acts for which his office has been developed. But he may comfort himself with the reflection that if the job were not so heavy there would be a cheaper man to manage it, and that the extent of the opposition is often the measure of real presidential business that is being performed. In any event, his only hope is in success, and he cannot go around the duty which

confronts him without inevitable failure. Conditions may easily make a mere compromiser of him. If they do, the waves will speedily close over his official remains forever. Some choice and magnanimous spirits will help him; but he need entertain no doubt that there will be plenty more on every side to try out the stuff that is in him, and that they will diligently attend to the trying-out process until enough occurs to convince them that his wisdom, his rational conception of his task, his love of justice and sense of humor, his constructive planning, his independence, and his fearlessness, are sufficient to ignore little people and prove him worthy of as great an opportunity for usefulness and honor as ever comes to any man."[197]

This sense of reward, whether conscious or unconscious, is made yet deeper to the president through the belief that any work or service belonging to his office during his own tenure, which is itself thoroughly worthy, will be continued after his retirement. He builds for the future. He plants his academic trees knowing that others will pluck their fruits and walk beneath their arches. The good he does, or the worthy plans which he makes, are not buried with his bones. If he is obliged to end his official career suffering disappointments, disappointments he should feel are superficial and more or less artificial and temporary. Down deep in his heart, he should know

[197] The University Presidency. By Andrew S. Draper. The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. XCVII, 1906. pp. 42-43.

and recognize that all he has worthily attained will live after him, and that the aims which he has not gained, if wise, will finally come to their realization. The disappointed Tappan of Michigan found his far-flung vision made good in the service of Angell and of Angell's successors. As Sidney Lanier wrote, in dark, lonely days: "Let my name perish,—the poetry is good poetry and the music is good music, and beauty dieth not, and the heart that needs it will find it."[198] The sower of good seed in good ground may rejoice in the assured harvest, even if he be not the reaper. As he has entered into the labors of his predecessors, so also he may be grateful that others shall enter into his own.

"The Avon to the Severn runs, the Severn to the sea;
And Wickliffe's dust must spread abroad, wide as the waters be."

In a vision yet broader and larger the president finds his compensating reward. For the mark he sets for himself he cannot attain. Its unattainableness is one of its dearest charms. If he could attain it, its pursuit would lack quickening. It is a flying, not a fixed, goal. To be able to unite one's life directly with lives which are, in their influences, eternal, is a cause of deepest and humblest self-congratulation. To be able to join one's service to a service which is

[198] The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman. By Fabian Franklin. Letter written to President Gilman by Sidney Lanier, October 23, 1874. p. 366.

as universal as man, as lasting as noblest achievement, as progressive as humanity, is itself a reward as deep as human character, as broad as human and humanistic reasoning, as high as human vision. It represents fullness of life, both as cause, condition, method, means and result.

The service of the presidency may well be compared and contrasted with the service of other callings. Free from the limitation of special preparation, a freedom which is both a blessing and a cursing, the office has peculiar advantages and disadvantages. It has, or should have, the pastoral relation of the minister. Yet, it lacks opportunities for regular writing and speaking. It has the personal relations of the medical profession. Yet it sees people at their best, and not at their worst, ever seeking to guide unto effective and whole healthfulness. It unites the intimate and the public relations of the legal calling, and also the relations to persons and to property, which this calling embodies. It has the practical adaptations of engineering in several branches. To architecture in particular it seems to be quite akin. For it demands and uses imagination as the foundation of construction. It has the public responsibilities of editorship in interpreting conditions and forces, men and affairs, and in seeking to guide while it enlightens. But it has a certain human touch which editorship is liable (but need not) to lack. It has the financial and administrative element of business. For it demands the proper use of financial and other

forces. Yet it measures values not in terms of profit and loss, but in terms of human welfare and character.

The office of the president of the American college might be compared to one of the two most important political offices of the world, the British prime minister. Each officer, of course, is to be gifted in the primary quality of leadership. In this quality is perhaps embraced the larger share of other elements. Many of these elements seem to unite and to reconcile the contradictories. He is to represent a proper combination of philosophic interpretation with practical adjustments. He is to be a hard worker. His conditions demand hard work. But also he is to have an instinct, or at least to give the impression of having an instinct, of leisure. He is to be frank and candid. Yet he knows well that he, like an ambassador, must maintain certain reservations. He is to unite a sense of optimism with an appreciation of the seriousness of many conditions and possibly also of their sordidness. Patience is to rest upon him as a robe, and yet he is to be gifted with energy and with a capacity for immediate, and for unique, action. The power to give rebuke without rancor or sting is to be united with a keen appreciation of excellence and of good service. He is to possess the indefinable quality of tact. But this should not be bought with the price of apparent sincerity. Each is to possess the constructive instinct. But this element is never to come into collision with immediate duty. Principles are to be

the standard of administration. But principles are to be properly adjusted to personalities. A sense of opportuneness must be almost instinctive, yet shiftiness should not be made a just charge. Each is to be worthy to command the loyalty of colleagues, yet each is to be just in judgment and in requirement. Magnanimity is to be the mood of each, and such great-mindedness and great-heartedness is yet not to coexist with a sense of indifferent approbation.

I venture to add,—although it is quite absurd,—that, if a college president could unite the boldness of Peel with the many-sidedness of Gladstone, the sagacity of Disraeli with the considerateness of Campbell-Bannerman, the breadth and calmness of Balfour with the popularity and personal charm of Lloyd George, and with the sense of strength of Asquith, what a human product would emerge! The result, one might add, with an ironical smile, would be as diverse and as dismaying as the union of the several earlier motifs with the final part of Wagner's "Ring." Of course, no single prime minister could unite these excellencies and contradictories. How much less the college president! Yet it is ever well to hold aloft the ideal.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE FUTURE OF THE OFFICE

The character of an office is determined by the conditions which attend, or by the elements which constitute it. A change in either conditions or elements makes a change in the character of the office. The conditions of the American college and university have changed fundamentally in a half century. From an institution having a few hundred students, to one having several thousands, from an institution having an endowment of a few hundred thousand dollars, to one having an endowment of many millions—as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Chicago, Stanford,—from an institution having a few and rather desultory relations, to one having many, important, and enduring affiliations with the public and with public service, represent changes which necessitate and create corresponding changes in the chief office itself. These changes are analogous to the changes in the office of the president of a bank, of a bank which has increased its capital stock from a quarter of a million to four millions, its deposits from ten millions to two hundred millions, and its staff from ten employes to more than a thousand. Yet most colleges are still small in the number of their faculty,

of their students, and in the amount of endowment. The office of the president in such a college still represents and performs the functions of the college that was typical and outstanding fifty years ago. In its president are still centered many functions. His duties are still manifold. His powers continue. His old rights are yet exercised. The future of the office of that type presents no peculiarly new problems. The man filling such an office is blessed, as his predecessors have been blessed, with opportunities for influencing human character which the ministering angels may well envy.

But the office of the president of the great college of two thousand or more students, or of the greater university with ten thousand, presents a problem new, complex, commanding.

The field of selection, by official boards, of a president for such a college or university has greatly enlarged, as the functions themselves have increased. The clerical field still remains, as is seen in Thompson of Ohio State, in Richmond of Union, and in Thomas of Rutgers; yet its boundaries have become narrower. Relatively fewer clergymen are fitted for the great office. The field of the business executive also receives cultivation, as was seen in Seth Low. The field, too, of pedagogy and of schools of education, or of psychology, is more generally drawn upon, as is evidenced in Angell of Yale, in Suzzallo of Washington, and in Coffman of Minnesota. The field of science, also, has in recent

years provided a great number of great presidents. Within two decades, the University of California, Leland Stanford University, Johns Hopkins, the University of Pennsylvania, Chicago, Cornell, and Dartmouth give illustrations of the worth of scientific training and teaching in preparation for the work of the college president. This method is carrying out, in many respects, a method of the English and Scotch universities. "Among the physicists who are, or have recently been, at the head of British Universities there occur to me Lord Kelvin, chancellor of the University of Glasgow; Lord Rayleigh, chancellor of the University of Cambridge; Sir Oliver Lodge, principal of the University of Birmingham; R. T. Glazebrook, successor to Lodge as principal of University College, Liverpool, and now head of the National Physical Laboratory; the late J. Viriamu Jones, principal of the University of Cardiff, and his successor, E. H. Griffiths, noted for their determinations of electrical and thermal constants, respectively." [199] In the fifteen years since this interpretation was made, the method has continued and has enlarged in its application.

Such variety in the field of choice of the president is both the cause and the result of the vastness of the work committed to the university, of the power of the forces given to the university for the doing of

[199] Letter from Arthur G. Webster, Worcester, Massachusetts. The Nation, Vol. LXXXIX. No. 2312. October 21, 1909. p. 376.

this work, and of the fullness and diversity of the conditions under which the university and the president perform their functions.

In the diversity of the duties of the office, there is found, however, one constant element. That element is the element of time applied to the length of the term of administration. This length is distinguished by its shortness. The facts are significant. Out of a selected list of four hundred and thirteen colleges and universities, up to the beginning of the present decade, it is found that, in their history, they have had no less than two thousand six hundred and fifty-six presidents, besides two hundred and ninety-two acting or temporary officers. All but nine of these colleges and universities have been chartered in the last century and a half. Many have been founded in recent decades. The different states bear impressive testimony. Twenty-nine colleges of Ohio have had two hundred and thirty-five presidents; fourteen colleges of Tennessee, eighty-seven; eleven colleges of Texas, sixty-three; seven colleges of Oregon, fifty-seven; three colleges of Maine, twenty-five; four colleges of New Jersey, twenty-six; twenty-one colleges of New York, one hundred and forty-four; five colleges of Connecticut, forty; thirteen colleges of Kansas, eighty-one; eighteen colleges of Iowa, one hundred and nineteen; eighteen colleges of Indiana, one hundred and forty-one; twenty-four colleges of Illinois, one hundred and sixty-two. So far as computation can be made, the average term is not far from five

years. The computation illustrates the truth of what Eliot wrote to Gilman, when the older officer had been in office seven years, and the younger was just beginning his noble term: "More and more I see that time is a necessary element of success in educational reforms, and that those of us who want to accomplish certain improvements must give ourselves the needed years for the work." [200]

The duration of the service of the president is shorter than the duration of that of college professors. The length of professorial service is impressive. In fifty-five institutions associated with the Presbyterian Church, are found fifty-two teachers each of whom has served more than twenty-five years. In these same colleges or academies are ninety-eight who have served almost thirty years each. The reasons of such contrasted lengths or brevities are not hard to find. The professor is trained for his task. The president is not trained for his duties. A professorship represents usually simple duties to be simply done. The presidency represents complex duties to be done with anxiety. The professorship can be filled usually to the expectations of associates. The presidency is seldom so filled. Therefore, the teaching term is long, the executive short.

In consideration of the future of the office, therefore, the first thing to be said is that the conditions attending the office should be so made that the length

[200] The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman. By Fabian Franklin. p. 357.

of its term may greatly increase. For a short term spells barrenness and academic ineffectiveness. Brevity stands for lack of prevision, for the laying of no plans, or, if plans be laid, and prophetic outlooks had, for either their failure or their overthrow. Long terms may, indeed, result in undue conservatism, or in academic stagnation. But long terms, even with their possibilities of evil, are less sterile than short ones. For the making of terms of service of proper length this whole volume itself might perhaps be called an intimation of methods and of means.[201]

A second commanding duty of the office of the future, as it should have been a duty of the past, is to give to the president full opportunity to think: to think on education in general, and in particular on the education which it belongs to his university to offer. The president is called an administrator and executive. He is such. But before he is either and while he is both, he is and should be a thinker. Rodin's "Thinker," in its pose, represents the president of the future. Some might add in parenthesis that the statue in its barbaric force also represents certain

[201] The length of the term of the superintendents of public instruction, in each of the American states, is somewhat significant:

"Two States (Nebraska and Tennessee) have had average tenures of less than 3 years; 11 States, of between 3 and 4 years; 9, of between 4 1/10 and 5 years; 6, of between 5 1/10 and 6 years; 12, of between 6 1/10 and 7 years; and 8, of more than 7 years."—The Chief State School Official. By Ward G. Reeder. Bulletin, 1924, No. 5. Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior. p. 30.

presidents of the past. In such reflection, the future president will write much and read more. In this reflection, he will, of course, include the special relations of the university to its environment. This environment may be largely confined to its own state, or it may be unlimited. In the consideration, the proper duty and rights of the university to, and in, the public and other schools, will bear a large part. Neither will he fail to include the duties and rights of the university in all the elements that constitute the community, civil, political, domestic, professional, industrial, financial, religious. He will also seek to forecast the future. What can the university do, to-day, to make its service richer a hundred years ahead? The president should have a sort of instinct for the long future and also for world affairs. His vision should be comprehensive in both time and space without being visionary. His thinking should be of the world without being "worldly." These and like questions should he be constantly asking himself. They are questions profoundest, most intricate, most pregnant in good or in evil, for the world's present and for the world's long future. Cardinal Newman would have made, in many relations, a poor president in an American university in the twentieth century. But what prophecies does he hold out in his kindling volumes of this duty,—the primary duty of the future president,—of thinking and of thoughtfulness!

A third duty of the future office is to give to the president ample opportunity for conferences with his

official associates. These conferences include formal meetings of faculty and of trustees. To such meetings he will carry his interpretations of opportunities, of perils, of powers, of weaknesses, of conditions, and of probable results. From such meetings, he will gather wisdom, strength, quickening of mind, forcefulness of right determination. In general, the formal conferences of official boards, and especially of the faculty, are given up too completely to the discussion of details and minor matters of academic government. Faculties should discuss, under the guidance and the inspiration of the president, questions of education, and of education in every relationship, communal and personal. Boards of trustees also should discuss the larger relations of the university to its state, to the nation, to the world, to the present, to the future. In preparing for and in conducting such conferences, the president finds full opportunity for the use of his zeal and wisdom, and, through these conferences, he will increase his wisdom without lessening his zeal. It may be added that such meetings become the more valuable as trustees or teachers prepare themselves in advance to offer enlightening contributions.[202]

[202] In the year 1907, Professor Barrett Wendell said of the meetings of the Harvard faculty:

"We are an unwieldy deliberative body with considerable party legislative powers, and wholly without party organization. The incessant speeches there have very little, if any, persuasive effect; they are essentially expressions of sincere intelligent opinion, to be taken at the moment for what it is worth. Each year, young men fancy that they

But such conferences are not simply formal. The president of the future should be in constant and close association with the heads of departments, with deans, with treasurers and bursars, with all members of the board of trust. He will desire to know significant facts, to follow moods, to become fully cognizant of the flowing and ebbing of the educational tides, to be quickened in respect to all opportunities, denials, perils, advantages. The decades immediately preceding have had many such presidents. The next decades will also see many, and even more, such presidents.[203]

are admitted to something like a parliament; each year, we older ones understand better that we are really sitting in something more like a Homeric council."—The Autobiography of Nathaniel Southgate Shaler. pp. 394-395.

[203] In the organization and carrying on of the work of a university, light may be found in the similar service of a great industrial company. Of the International Harvester Company, Mr. Harold F. McCormick writes me:

"The Board of Directors meets about once a month. The Officers meet in session twice a week, at what are called Executive Council meetings. The Managers meet once every two weeks, to collaborate and hear reports and references as to specialized work of the Company according to each sphere. The Board of Directors takes the responsibility of the policy of the Company and directs its course in general. The Executive Council passes on large projects and policies for recommendation and reference to the Board of Directors. The Department Managers' meetings are simply to unify the organization as a whole and for the dissemination of knowledge. The Executive Council votes on questions, as the Board of Directors does, but this vote is not authoritative but is recommendatory to the President, who has final authority to make a decision, taking the

The typical president of the future, fourthly, will also not fail, as have certain presidents of the past, to include an opportunity which, at the present moment, is suffering neglect, the opportunity of knowing and of being known by his students. To this condition I have frequently alluded in preceding pages. It is, however, ever to be borne in mind that, with the possible exception of the great cause of research, the student creates and represents the primary end of the very existence of the college. All else is only means, methods, measures. The constant and dire peril is to forget the end and to transfer the proper interest of the end to the means. Many presidents interpret the relation to the student with a certain degree of jocoseness. "It would be a very good place, if there were no students,"—and the spirit of the semi-humorous remark is suffered to be practiced. Such

various views into consideration. The President reports to the Board differing votes on various projects or policies, so that the Board may know the point of view and the reasons for any difference of opinion. In between sessions of these groups the Officers report to the President, for his decision, anything desired, but, in the meantime, carry such authority and make such decisions as each feels his responsibility to be and as each Officer would be confident of the outcome of his opinion in any given case. The form of our organization is definite in the lines of authority and responsibility, so that each person may have his base from which to operate. That being true and secure, then collaboration and harmony and informal exchange of helpfulness is the usual vote, so that we really are like a happy family in our communications and in our mutual assistance of one another."

a spirit is to be lamented and such methods eliminated. The student is the center, even if not the circumference, of the whole academic circle. If it is impossible for the president to know each one of two thousand or three thousand undergraduates, as of course it is impossible, he yet should make the number of those who are unknown as small as may be. Certain presidents, as Andrews and Shanklin, had a knack of knowing many. Yet, several points of personal relationship may, as one thinks of the future, be emphasized:

The president will make use of all general assemblies for meeting men and women. The athletic gatherings, for example, which evoke most enthusiasm and call out largest numbers, represent one of his opportunities. The daily chapel, or similar service, also gives him a chance of frequent speech, as well as a regular and sympathetic audience.

The president should, by his bearing and talk, make clear that he wants to know his students. The recognition by them of his desire helps to promote an atmosphere of good fellowship which serves to invigorate the best forces. It may be added that, if the president be a scholar, his giving a series of lectures, or his offering a course of instruction, vastly enlarges and deepens his field of influence. Such an opportunity Angell of Michigan greatly appreciated and constantly used.

The ideal president of the next decades and century will also, fifthly, hold relationships, constant in time

and vital in fruitfulness, with the great bodies which constitute society. His duties and rights do not end when he passes out of the college gates. Indeed, not a few of these rights and duties only begin at his going out of the gates. Bodies religious, industrial, civic, have claims on him which he will be glad to recognize. These bodies help to constitute the state and the society which he serves, and these bodies give support to the university of which he is the responsible head. He will not neglect such opportunities. At these gatherings he will be a grateful co-worker, and, as may be fitting, a welcome interpreter of the higher, intellectual forces and foundations of the community. Viscount Bryce, though a loyal Britisher, was not only a wise interpreter, but a devoted apostle of things American. Bryce, in many ways, fulfilled with grateful acceptableness the duties which the American college president of the future should delight to perform. May he indeed have a large share of Bryce's spirit and ability.[204] Gilman was possessed by a similar spirit, though not with an equal degree of facility. Godkin of the *Nation* once wrote to him: "I should like to have testified to my sense of your value as a 'Good American.' There is no man to whom the country is more indebted."[205]

[204] Indeed Lord Bryce once said to me that he would like to try his hand at being the president of an American university. Of course, the remark is not to be taken too seriously.

[205] The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman. By Fabian Franklin. p. 361.

The public services of Gilman, beginning in New Haven, continued in the small days of the University of California, were quite as precious in the mixed conditions of the Pacific Coast in 1873, as they became under the more normal conditions of Baltimore in the following quarter-century.

If the president of the future can limit his service to this quartette of duties, thinking, conferring with associates, with students, and public relations, he will be set free from other conditions and claims to which, under present circumstances, he is constrained to give an exhausting heed.

First. He will be made free from that work, so often placed on his shoulders, of the soliciting of funds and of the headship of campaigns for endowment. He will not be obliged to serve as a financial agent. He will not, as did Cheney of Bates and Strong of Carleton, of the earlier time, go up and down the country begging for funds, or as did Provost Harrison of the University of Pennsylvania in getting money for annual expenses. At the close of a financial campaign, the beloved Taylor of Vassar said:

"Permit me to conclude with the statement of my deep conviction that the employment of the President of the College in this kind of labor does not commend itself to my experience or my judgment. If men are to be reached effectively it must generally be through gradual approach, by creating interest and developing that to which appeals may be fitly made, and a limited effort, while awakening all true friends

of the College, gives no time for the educative work essential with the indifferent. That work the President may well undertake, but it is separated widely from the task of direct solicitation of funds. The one is fitting,—the other exposes him to conditions that are exhausting, depressing, humiliating. . . . It may be doubted if the dignity of his position can sustain any long continuance of such labor. I think the office of College President has been distinctly lowered in the estimation of our business men by this constant resort to Wall Street in pursuit of college funds. Times have changed. The spirit of rich men beset and wearied by innumerable demands, has grown less patient of the importunity of the college president, the crowded, hurried hours of business make his presence less welcome, and the attitude of most has become defensive (when not offensive). The College should recognize these changed conditions and make its always necessary appeals through indirect approach, or after securing the interest and intelligent appreciation of those whose help it seeks. Our experience here justifies this opinion."[206]

Second. The president of the future will also be set free from undertaking that most delicate and difficult responsibility of selecting teachers. To the faculty and its fitting committees will be committed the doing of this constant, complex and delicate duty. He will be a consulting and consulted member of the nomi-

[206] The Life and Letters of James Monroe Taylor. By Elizabeth Hazelton Haight. pp. 197-198.

nating body. To his opinion will be given proper weight. But the comprehensive and preliminary duty shall be allotted to men better trained and wiser for this particular service. Coöperative, and not sole, responsibilities shall belong to him.

Third. The president will also not be obliged, as he is too largely at present, to attend to the moral discipline of the students. To the students as persons, as I have intimated, he will give himself in just measure of best fellowship. But with students in technical forms he will normally hold few relations. These duties and rights will be performed by officers, as they now usually are, specially fitted to assume them. Thus he will be liberated from many details which hasten resignations, as was, for instance, found to be the sad facts in the case of Everett and of Sparks of Harvard, after only few years of service.

Fourth. Furthermore, the president will, in the future, not be obliged to attend to details of physical, material administration. He will not be a business manager of his university. He will not serve as a purchasing agent. He will not be the chief carpenter, or plumber, or brick mason, or landscape architect and supervisor. Interested he will be, and ought to be, in all these forms of general service, but he will recognize the fitness of committing these fundamental or technical material elements of common endeavor to those peculiarly fitted to be entrusted with them.

With the elimination of such functions, financial, pedagogical, disciplinary, physical, the president of

the future will be able to make his administration what he most wishes, and what his associates also wish it to be made. Free from "multitudinous cares," as Angell once wrote,[207] he will give himself to his few great, comprehensive, elemental tasks. He will no longer have his time "nibbled away by ducks," as Wayland of Brown once said his time suffered. His work will take on, in its great articulations and divisions, such headships as are found in the organization of industrial concerns. But it will also have certain intimate, personal relationships which no material service usually commands.

Through such eliminations and assignments, five perils of future academic administration will be avoided:

First. The dual system of administration. The duality, according to certain schemes, consists of one officer having charge of the educational, and one officer having charge of the business side. Such duality does not work, either for harmony, or for economy, or for efficiency. These duplex relations are separated by a wall so thin that each relation or function belongs at many points to the other. The dual system, for instance, established in the public schools of Cleveland, several years ago, has resulted in disarrangements and in wastes of many sorts. The system as applied to universities is fraught with funda-

[207] The Life of Daniel Coit Gilman. By Fabian Franklin. Letter from President Angell to President Gilman, November 22, 1900. p. 347.

mental difficulties. Let there be subordinates, and superordinates, but no coördinates in administration.

Second. There will also be eliminated the peril of an annual, or similar, chairmanship of the faculty. This method of government has, in a few universities, at a few times, been attempted. The more outstanding instance is found at the University of Virginia. Jefferson feared autocracy in college as in other government. The determination that his foundation should not thus be subjected prevailed for more than three quarters of a century. But the chairmanship of the faculty did not represent that unity and promote that community spirit which should be the mark of university administration. It was fortunate for the University of Virginia that, when the lack of these qualities became most serious, the university could then select as its president one who so well embodied, and was able to supply, them.[208]

Third. A third peril is also removed, the peril of committing the whole control of a college to its faculty. Such a method of control ruled in the first decades of its history at Harvard, and attempts to restore it, after its languishing, were made in the eighteenth century. In the whole control I especially include the financial. For the financial control is fundamental,—fundamental not as a final cause, but fundamental as a formative force or condition. This element belongs to the financier, not to the scholar.

[208] History of the University of Virginia. By Philip Alexander Bruce. Vol. V. pp. 1-66.

The financial integrity of American colleges, for almost three hundred years, is a proof of the wisdom of committing the investment of funds to those specially fitted for the performance of such a serious and delicate responsibility. It is as true that scholars and teachers should not permit themselves to take on financial functions, as that the financiers should not arrogate to themselves scholastic duties. The autocracy of trustees in affairs scholastic is a dire evil. The autocracy of teachers in affairs financial would be nothing less than disastrous. Both dangers are to be avoided. The attempts, emerging in various parts at present, to make the faculty of a college its sole corporate body and to entrust financial affairs to such a body, is doomed, as I have already intimated, to failure, as it ought to be.

Fourth. A fourth peril is also thus removed,—the peril of putting the office of the president into a commission, composed of deans, or similar officers, of the several colleges of a university. Such a condition was constituted in Northwestern University of Illinois, on the retirement of Harris as president. The defects and deficiencies of this method, as a method of academic government, has illustration also in the disastrous consequences of a similar method obtaining in the earlier years of the Great War. The method in the field academic, as in the field military, represents friction, both as waste and as irritation, irresponsibility, uncertainty, inefficiency.

"No institution of learning," said President An-

drews, "has tried the plan of assigning its main executive function to a faculty or to a faculty committee or to faculty members in rotation without complete or relative failure. On the other hand—a significant fact—American higher education dates its present era of triumph exactly from the time when colleges began centralizing executive power and, so to speak, 'mobilizing' their presidents. This reform was necessitated, not because faculties did not contain many men capable of good executive service if permanently and responsibly set thereto, but by the fact that the administration of a great educational plant is specialist work of a high order, giving rise almost daily to new and complicated problems, with which the ablest heads, otherwise preoccupied, are in no condition to cope." [209]

In making an argument for a government by commission, composed of deans and other officers, one is inclined to forget that crises,—financial, personal, and other,—the university is not infrequently called to pass through. It is only bodies of financial and of other skill, commanding the confidence of the community, which can carry the academic craft into the desired haven. Eliot says: "The President and Fellows between 1630 and 1810 had brought the College safely through a series of wars, paper money periods,

[209] The Organization of the University and the Distributions of Authority and Function Therein. By E. B. Andrews. Transactions and Proceedings of the National Association of State Universities. 1907. pp. 114-115.

commercial panics, the Revolution, and the first twenty years of the Constitution, and were naturally proud of this record."[210]

Fifth. Through such eliminations, moreover, the president of the future will himself be saved from being an autocrat, as he sometimes permits himself to be, and also will be saved from being charged with being an autocrat which he not infrequently is charged with being. The president can afford to bear the charge, and the community can afford it too, if one have the ability to perform the functions of an autocrat as had Napoleon. But most presidents cannot create the sense of loyalty which Napoleon created, or quicken the imagination as he quickened it. Most presidents, if they do allow themselves to become autocrats, have to be content with playing the rôle without loyalty, as did Louis XIV. In his autobiography, White says, at length, of his own administration:

"I had observed in various American colleges that a fundamental and most injurious error was made in relieving trustees and faculty from responsibility, and concentrating all in the president. The result, in many of these institutions, had been a sort of atrophy, —the trustees and faculty being, whenever an emergency arose, badly informed as to the affairs of their institutions, and really incapable of managing them.

[210] The Function of a University. By Charles W. Eliot. Harvard Alumni Bulletin, Vol. XXIV, June 22, 1922, No. 37. p. 936.

This state of things was the most serious drawback to President Tappan's administration at the University of Michigan, and was the real cause of the catastrophe which finally led to his break with the regents of that university, and his departure to Europe, never to return. Worse still was the downfall of Union College, Schenectady, from the position which it had held before the death of President Nott. Under Drs. Nott and Tappan the tendency in the institutions above named was to make the trustees in all administrative matters mere ciphers, and to make the faculty more and more incapable of administering discipline or conducting current university business. That system concentrated all knowledge of university affairs and all power of every sort in the hands of the president, and relieved trustees and faculty from everything except nominal responsibility. From the very beginning I determined to prevent this state of things at Cornell. Great powers were indeed given me by the trustees, and I used them; but in the whole course of my administration I constantly sought to keep ample legislative powers in the board of trustees and in the faculty. I felt that the university, to be successful, should not depend on the life and conduct of any one man; that every one of those called to govern and to manage it, whether president or professor, should feel that he had powers and responsibilities in its daily administration. Therefore it was that I inserted in the fundamental laws of the university a provision that

the confirmation by the trustees of all nominations of professors should be by ballot; so that it might never be in the power of the president or any other trustee unduly to influence selections for such positions. I also exerted myself to provide that in calling new professors they should be nominated by the president, not of his own will, but with the advice of the faculty and should be confirmed by the trustees. I also provided that the elections of students to fellowships and scholarships and the administration of discipline should be decided by the faculty, and by ballot. The especial importance of this latter point will not escape those conversant with university management. I insisted that the faculty should not be merely a committee to register the decrees of the president, but that it should have full legislative powers to discuss and to decide university affairs. Nor did I allow it to become a body merely advisory: I not only insisted that it should have full legislative powers, but that it should be steadily trained in the use of them." [211]

Even after these five eliminations, there remain still several diverse elements and functions, beside the commanding fundamental duties of which I have written, to which the president of the future will give himself. In a single long term, the demands for varieties of service will emerge, and they will increase with the increasing length of the term. At one time, stress

[211] Autobiography of Andrew Dickson White. Vol. I. pp. 435-436.

should be given to the element of coöperation. At another, opportunity should be opened for quiet reflection. At yet another, the privileges of association with students should be peculiarly emphasized. And at still a fourth period, the public relation should receive special attention. The wise president will try to find wherein he may be more and most useful. No small share of the worth of his administration will depend on his discernment of differing conditions, on the wisdom of his appreciation of, and on the strength of his application to, each need. In different institutions, too, these different duties will differ, as, at different times, they will differ in the same institution. At one time, Chicago may be served by a president who gives himself to work within the gates. At the same time, Minnesota may gain largest advantage from public service in and to the state. In the same decade, Cornell may get richest results from a president who cultivates, in all ways, both the undergraduate and the professional student body. The work of Harper at Chicago, of organization and of public relationship, was well supplemented by the internal work of Judson, as the work of Judson was confirmed and enlarged by the aggressive work of his successor, Burton.

The president will seek, moreover, to be a coördinating power. He will be not simply an interpreter of conditions. He will be also a director, or maker, of conditions, transmitting and allocating them as educational forces. To the weak, he will seek to give

strength; to the strong he may add strength; to the confused, analysis; to the overambitious, restraint; to the pessimistic, hopefulness; to the overworked, recreation; to the indolent, quickening; to the superficial, enrichment. He will ever try to assign the most fruitful fields of service to his associates, and to aid them in doing their individual duties. He will also seek to see the relations of different departments of instruction to each other, and to adjust interests and forces to the common welfare. While he thus strives to aid and to save others, he shall not suffer himself to become a castaway. For the sake of the work itself, he is to have great working power unused. The business of being a college president is the most dangerous of all professional business. It is subject to crises of all kinds. A report in a newspaper, so true it cannot be denied, so false that to deny it would call unmerited attention to its publication, so personal that to protest would give evidence of egotism, may take away strong supports from an administration. A fire in a dormitory, resulting in loss of life, as occurred in Colby in a recent year, or reports of revolting hazing, as made at several colleges every autumn, may create public dismay and revolt. A fraternity initiation, by which a novitiate, even of his own volition, goes through certain sufferings and which may result in death, arouses a storm of indignation at a president for having even tacitly allowed it. To meet such crises, the president of the future should carry a large reserve of force of body, of mind, of

heart, of will. Not needed usually in the daily round and common task, these reserves will be needed on occasions when their lack might prove to be disastrous. With all his proper progressiveness, and proper, or improper, expenditures of himself, he yet should keep himself strong for the swift floods which at some time are sure suddenly to bear down upon the university and upon himself.

As I bring this interpretation to a close, my pen lingers. For as I have written these paragraphs, through many months and through parts of several years, I have found my mind reflecting on the perfect president,—the perfect president of the future. Of course, the reflection represents the Platonic idea which is indeed an ideal. If one could unite the wisdom, the wit, and the affection of Jowett, without his eccentricities, the progressiveness and boldness of Pepper, without his weaknesses, the patience of Nott, the enthusiasm and hopefulness of Harper, the culture of Gilman, the sense of world relations of White, the vision of Seth Low, the solidity of Barnard, the prophetic instinct of Wayland, the philosophical discrimination of Mark Hopkins, of Julius Seelye, the humanity of Northrop, the force of Draper of Illinois, the genius of Bascom, the suggestiveness of Hyde of Bowdoin,—if one could unite all that is characteristic of these men into one personality, what a president would result! One might add, what an impossibility! But not only what an impossibility, but also

what an incongruity, what a contradictory, what an absurdity! Even if all these characteristics could be united, one would not necessarily get a perfect president. A catalogue of virtues does not create a man, as a catalogue of ships does not make a navy. In particular, if from this comprehensive personality were eliminated the less worthy elements, the eccentricities, the arbitrariness, the aloofness, the visionariness, the indolence, the intolerance, the prejudice, the ungraciousness, which may go along with richest and best qualities, what a president we indeed should have! We are searching for him; we are trying to create him. Ultimately, when the perfect man shall have come, with him also will come the perfect president.

# INDEX


Adams, C. K., Allusion to, 166;
Relations of Tyler to, 42-43.
Adams, John Quincy, quoted, 281-2.
Adaptability of President, 151 ff.
Administration, Dual System of, 326-7.
Age of President, 115 ff.;
at Retirement, 279.
Alderman, of Virginia, Allusion to, 108, note.
Amherst, Allusion to, 82-83, note.
Anderson, of Rochester, Allusion to, 104.
Andrews, E. B., Allusion to, 23 ff., 183, 265;
Influence of, 66;
quoted, 45 note, 328-9.
Angell, of Michigan, Allusion to, 129;
quoted, 62-63, 89-91, 153, 292 note, 304.
Aristotle, Allusion to, 163, 229, 289.
Arnold, Matthew, Allusion to, 90.
Asquith, Allusion to, 21 note; quoted, 67-68.
Athletics and President, 270-1.
*Atlantic Monthly*, quoted, 27 ff., 305-6.
Aurelius, Marcus, Prayer of, 200.
Autocracy of President, 190 ff., 255.
Ayers, of Cincinnati, Allusion to, 194 ff.

Baccalaureate sermon, 221 ff.
Balfour, quoted, 97.
Barnard, F. A. P., Allusion to, 212.
Bascom, Allusion to, 245; quoted, 16, 124.
Benefactors, 271 ff.
Benson, A. C., Allusion to, 219;
Letter from, 120-1;
quoted, 250-1.
Bentley, example of autocracy, 192.
Bliss, Daniel, Breadth of, 302-3 note;
Resignation of, 282.
Brevity of term of President, 314 ff.
Brooks, Phillips, Allusion to, 114, 261.
Bryce, Viscount, Allusion to, 322, and note.
Budget, Share in making of, by Faculty, 52;
Trustees' relations to, 25-26.
Burgon, quoted, 98, 206, 210.
Burton, Ernest DeWitt, quoted, 179-80, note.

Butler, Annual Reports of, 224-5;
quoted, 52-53.

Cambridge, Titles of Heads of Colleges of, 4, 6.
Campbell-Bannerman, quoted, 69.
Carnegie, Allusion to, 266, 274.
Carter, quoted, 47-48, 172-3, 222-3, 217 note.
Cattell, J. McK., quoted, 200-2, 203.
Chancellor, Title of, 4-5.
Chauncy, of Harvard, Allusion to, 127.
Churches, Relation of President to, 82 ff.
Churchill, Randolph, Allusion to, 205.
Cicero, Allusion to, 208.
Cincinnati, University of, Allusion to, 194 ff.
Clark, J. G., Allusion to, 273-4.
Clark, J. W., quoted, 126-7, 158-9.
Clark, T. A., of Illinois, quoted, 69.
Clark University, Confidence of Trustees in President Hall, 29-30;
Professors of, called to Chicago, 94-95.
Columbia, 3-4.
Commencement, Importance of, 220-1.
Commission as Governing Body, 328-30.
Community, General, Relation of President to, 103 ff.
Comte, Allusion to, 253.
Conciliatoriness of President, 153 ff.
Condescension of President, 262.
Constructive Conservatism of President, 164-5.
Cornell, Ezra, Allusion to, 20.
Cornell University, Statistics of, 51-52.

Dartmouth College, Allusion to, 58.
Dasent, A. I., quoted, 138-9, 283.
Davis, H. W. C., quoted, 296, note.
Day, of Yale, Allusion to, 48, 170-1.
Dean, The Work of, 45 ff.
Deceptiveness of President, 166 ff.
Delane, of *Times*, Editorial Prudence of, 138-9;
Retirement of, 283.
Democritus, Allusion to, 208.
Dexter, F. B., quoted, 2-3, note.
*Dial, The*, Editorial quoted, 194 ff.
Dodge, Bayard, Allusion to Inauguration of, 290-1.
Draper, quoted, 27 ff., 305-6.
Dunster, Allusion to, 1.
Durand, G. H., quoted, 148-9.
Dwight, the elder, quoted, 12-14, note.
Dwight, younger, Allusion to, 242;
quoted, 36-37, 48, 63-64, 84 note, 170-1.
Dyer, Louis, quoted, 119.
*Educational Review*, quoted, 23-24, 71 ff., 176-7.

Eliot, C. W., Allusion to, 91, 96-97, 263;
Annual Reports of, 224-5;
Letter from, 132 ff., note;
quoted, 35, 46-47 note, 71 ff., 81-82, 201, 210-211, 256-7, 298, 301, 315, 329-30.
Eliot, W. G., of St. Louis, Allusion to, 141.
Emerson, R. W., quoted, 167-8, 234-5.
Energy of President, 143.

Faculty, Annual Chairmanship of, 327;
as Members of Boards, 51 ff., 189;
Budget, Share in making, by, 52;
Relation of Members of, to Each Other, 43 ff.;
of President to, 30 ff.;
to Trustees, 49 ff.;
serving as Trustees, 327-8.
Fairchild, of Oberlin, Allusion to, 32.
Faunce, of Brown, Allusion to, 66.
Field of Selection of President, 312 ff.
Fishser, H. A. L., quoted, 294-5.
Foresight of President, 134 ff.
Foster, W. T., quoted, 232.
Founders, 271 ff.
Franklin, Fabian, quoted, 34, 80, 307, 315, 322, 326, 361.
Friendliness of President to Students, 60 ff.
Future of Office of President, 311 ff.

Garman, Allusion to, 295.
Gavit, J. P., quoted, 11-12, note.
George, Lloyd, Allusion to, 205.
Gildersleeve, B. L., quoted, 33 ff.
Gilman, D. C., Allusion to, 33-34, 91, 218, 257, 315, 322-3;
Retirement of, 79-80.
Gladstone, Allusion to, 97, 168, 277-8;
quoted, 173.
Godkin, of the *Nation*, and Gilman, 322.
Graduates, Relation of President to, 73 ff.
Graduate School, Relation of President to, 88.
Graves, F. P., quoted, 290-1.
Greene, John M., and Sophia Smith, 276.

Haight, Elizabeth H., Vassar, quoted, 323-4.
Haldane, Viscount, quoted, 180.
Hall, G. Stanley, Allusion to, 94-95;
Confidence of Trustees in, 29-30;
quoted, 47 note, 257, 273-4.
Hamilton College, Teachers in, 39-40.
Hamlin, Cyrus, Allusion to, 150, 264;
Retirement of, 284.
Harper, of Chicago, Allusion to, 94-95, 129, 261;
Energy of, 145.
Harris, President George, Allusion to, 247-8.

*Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, quoted, 329-30.
Hawkins, of Oriel, Allusion to, 98, 205-6, 210.
Hazard, of Wellesley, quoted, 172.
Health of President, Special Value of, 123.
Hoar, George F., quoted, 225 ff.
Hopkins, Mark, Allusion to, 25, 216-7 note.
Hospital, St. Bartholomew's, Record of students of, 233 note.
House, Letter to, from Page, 155-6.
Humor and Wit, Sense of, in President, 242.
Hutchins, of Michigan, quoted, 110-1.
Hyde, of Bowdoin, Allusion to, 115, 129, 218; quoted, 116-7, 258-9.

Imagination of President, 242-3.
Impulsiveness of President, 263-4.
Institutional Accommodation of President, 160 ff.

Jordan, David Starr, quoted, 18-19 note, 160, 176, 258 note, 275-6.
Jowett, of Balliol, Allusion to, 60-61, 67-68, 74, 80-81, 129, 219.
Judicialness of President, 130 ff.

Kant, Allusion to, 180-1.
Kelvin, Allusion to, 21 note.
Kitchener, Allusion to, 157-8.
Knoxville, University at, Allusion to, 251-2.

Laboriousness of President, 206 ff.
Lanier, Sidney, quoted, 307.
Leadership of President, 15 ff., 137 ff.
Lee, Robert E. (General), Allusion to, 174-5, 183.
Lee, Robert E. (Captain), quoted, 174-5.
Leigh, Provost of King's College, Allusion to, 117-8, 134.
Low, Seth, Allusion to, 216; quoted, 231.
Lowell, President, Allusion to, 219; quoted, 246-7.
Lowell, J. R., quoted, 151.

Maclean, of Princeton, Friendliness of, 67.
McCormick, H. F., quoted, 319-20, note.
McCosh, of Princeton, Allusion to, 67; quoted, 79, 99-100, 185-6; Resignation of, 282.
Machiavelli, quoted, 139-40.
Maitland, F. W., quoted, 294-5.
Management, Scientific, 260-1.
Mather, Increase, Allusion to, 2.
Matriculation, Importance of, 219.
Mill, J. S., quoted, 180.
Morley, Edward W., Allusion to, 70.

Morley, Lord, Allusion to, 168;
quoted, 97, 277-8.
Munroe, J. P., quoted, 33, 59, 292-3, 297-8.
Murlin, Allusion to, 96.
Murray, Dean, of Princeton, quoted, 31-32, 64.
Myers, Professor P. V. N., Testimony of, 197 ff.

*Nation, The*, quoted, 313.
North, Edward, "Old Greek," Allusion to, 205-6.
North, S. N. D., quoted, 205-6.
Norton, C. E., Allusion to, 128.
Nott, of Union, Allusion to, 108 note, 171.

Oberlin, Allusion to, 32.
Office and Title of President, 1 ff.
Olds, Quotation from Inaugural of, 14 note.
Optimism of President, 147 ff.;
or Pessimism, 227-8.
Organizing Power of President, 183.
*Outlook*, quoted, 116-7.
Oxford, Titles of Heads of Colleges of, 4, 16.

Page, Letter from, to House, 155-6.
Palmer, Alice Freeman, Allusion to, 172;
Influence of, 65-66;
Resignation of, 278-9 note.
Palmer, G. H., quoted, 65-66, 278-9 note.
Pantaretoff, Bulgarian Minister, Allusion to, 2, 64.
Paris, University of, 8.
Parkin, quoted, 288-9.
Patience, Need of, in President, 21-22, 149;
of Trustees for President, 22.
Pattison, Mark, Allusion to, 125, 129;
quoted, 136, 146-7, 159-60, 182-3-4.
Patton, of Princeton, Allusion to, 129.
Paulsen, F., quoted, 121.
Peabody, A. P., quoted, 61, 127, 131-2.
Peirce, C. S., Allusion to, 70.
Pennsylvania, University of, 3.
Pepper, of Pennsylvania, Allusion to, 103, 129, 261;
Energy of, 144;
Generosity of, 142;
Resignation of, 282-3;
Working Habits of, 125-6.
Perils of President, Historic, Administrative, Political, Ecclesiastical, 231 ff.;
of Routine, 241 ff.;
of Silence, 264-5;
of Smallness, 248 ff.;
of Truckling to Wealth, 265 ff.
Perry, Bliss, quoted, 231-2.
Personality of President, 175 ff.
Pessimism or Optimism of President, 227-8.
Pitt, quoted, 21-22.
Plato, his Philosopher-King, 114.
*Popular Science Monthly*,

quoted, 161-2 note, 193-4 note.
Porter, of Yale, Allusion to, 38-39, 63-64, 172-3;
an Optimist, 147-8;
quoted, 74 ff.
Power, Organizing, of President, 183 ff.
Predecessor of President, 239-40.
President, Age of, on Accepting Office, 115 ff.; on Retiring, 279 ff.; Adjusting Functions to Conditions, by, 332-3; Brevity of Term of, 314 ff.; Contrasted with English and German Officers, 119 ff.; Duty of Discovering "Sports," 70; Effect of Executive Service on, 261-2; Freedom of, Financial, 323-4; from Material Administration, 325; from Moral Discipline of Students, 325; Field of Selection of, 312 ff.; Friendliness to Students, 60 ff.; Future of Office of, 311 ff.; History of Title of, 1 ff.; Institutional Accommodation of, 160 ff.; Leadership of, 15 ff., 137 ff.; Nomination of Teachers, by, 324-5; as Officer and Personality, 123 ff.; Perils of, Historic, Administrative, Political, Ecclesiastical, 231 ff.; of Routine, 241 ff.; of Silence, 264-5; of Smallness, 248 ff.; of Truckling to Wealth, 265 ff.; Personality of, 175 ff.; as Preacher, 84; Predecessor of, 239-40; as Presiding Officer, 57; Prime Minister, Compared with, 309-10; Prophetic Interest of, 20 ff.; Qualities of: Adaptability, 151 ff.; Autocracy, 190 ff., 255; Conciliatoriness, 153 ff.; Condescension, 262; Constructive Conservatism, 164-5; Coordinating Force, 333 ff.; Deceptiveness, 166 ff.; Energy, 143 ff.; Foresight, 134 ff; Health, 123 ff.; Imagination, 242-3; Impulsiveness, 263-4; Judicialness, 130 ff.; Laboriousness, 206 ff.; Optimism, 147 ff., and Pessimism, 227-8; Organizing Power, 183 ff.; Patience, need of, 21-22, 149 ff., of Trustees with, 22; Progressiveness or Aggressiveness, 21; Proportion, Sense of, 163 ff.; Timidity, 169; Wit and Humor, Sense of, 242; Relations of, 10 ff.; to Athletics, 270-1; to Churches, 82 ff.; to the General Community, 103 ff.; to Faculty, 30 ff.; to Founders and Benefactors, 271 ff.; to Graduates, 73 ff.; to Graduate School, 88 ff.; to Other Presidents, 92 ff.; to the Press, 98 ff.; to High (Preparatory) School, 88; to Students,

58 ff., 320-1; to Trustees, 10 ff.; Religion of, 178 ff.; Reports (Annual) of, 223 ff.; Resignation of, 277 ff.; Respect and Love for, 165 ff.; Rewards of, 287 ff.; Salary of, 213 ff.; Scholarship of, 128 ff.; as Speaker and Writer, 106 ff., 218 ff.; Succession of, 285-6; as a Thinker, 208 ff., 294-5, 316-7; Willingness of, to be Forgotten, 285.
Press, Contrast of Newsvalue of Athletics and Educational Concerns, 102 note;
Relation of President to, 98 ff.
Prime Minister and President, 309-10.
Princeton, Allusion to, 185 ff.
Principal, Title of, 5, 7.
Proctor, Title of, 7.
Professor, Length of Term of, 315.
Proportion, Sense of, in President, 163 ff.
Provost, Title of, 5-6.

Qualities of President, *see under* President.
Quincy, Edmund, quoted, 35, 130, 281-2.
Quincy, Josiah, of Harvard, Allusion to, 35, 61, 130;
Resignation of, 281-2.

Raymond, of Vassar, quoted, 29, 41, 145-6, 213-4, 272-3, 275, 276-7.
Rector, Title of, 4 ff.
Reeder, W. G., quoted, 316 note.
Relations of President, 10 ff. *See also under* President.
Religion of President, 178 ff.
Reports of President, 223 ff.
Respect and Love for President, 165 ff.
Resignation of President, 277 ff.
Rewards of President, 287 ff.
Rhees, Rush, Allusion to, 176-7.
Rich Men, free from Wish to Dominate, 269 ff.;
as Trustees, 266 ff.
Robert, of Robert College, and Cyrus Hamlin, 284.
Robinson, of Brown, Opinion about, 62.
Rogers, of M. I. T., Allusion to, 210.
Rockefeller, Allusion to, 266, 274.
Root, Elihu, quoted, 39-40.
Routine, Peril of President, 241 ff.
Rowland, of Johns Hopkins, Allusion to, 602.
Ruskin, John, quoted, 128.

Salary of President, 213 ff.
Scholarship of President, 128 ff.
School, High (Preparatory) and Graduate, 88 ff.
*School and Society*, quoted, 102 note, 109-10, 252, 291.
*Science*, quoted, 232.
*Scribner's Magazine*, quoted, 231-32.

Seelye, L. Clark, of Smith, Allusion to, 67;
quoted, 176-7, 201-2.
Shaler, N. S., quotation from Autobiography of, 318-9 note.
Shanklin, of Wesleyan, Allusion to, 67.
Sidgwick, Henry, Allusion to, 294-5.
Silence of President, Peril of, 264-5.
Sloane, W. M., quoted, 67, 79, 99-100 note, 185-6, 282.
Smallness in President, Peril of, 248 ff.
Smith, Sophia, and John M. Greene, 276.
Societies of Students, 206 ff.
Southey, Allusion to, 209.
Speaking and Writing of President, 106 ff., 218 ff.
Stanford, Mrs. Senator, Allusion to, 275-6.
Strachey, J. St. Loe, quoted, 101.
Students, Friendliness of President to, 60 ff.;
Relation of President to, 58 ff., 320-1.
Societies of, 206 ff.
Sturtevant, of Illinois, Allusion to, 141.
Succession of President, 285-6.
Sumner, W. G., Allusion to his "Social Classes," 303.
Swing, A. T., quoted, 32.

Tappan, of Michigan, Allusion to, 237 ff.
Taylor, J. M., Allusion to, 99;
quoted, 323-4.
Thinking of the President, 208 ff.;
duty of the President, 316-7.
Thorpe, F. N., quoted, 37 note, 103, 125-6, 142 ff., 282-3.
Thring, of Uppingham, Allusion to, 288-9.
Timidity of President, 169.
Title, of Chancellor, 4-5;
of President, 1 ff.;
of Principal, 5, 7;
of Proctor, 7;
of Provost, 5-6;
of Rector, 4 ff.;
of Warden, 6.
Trustees, Conservatism of, 16 ff.;
Leadership of, by President, 18-19;
Names of Board of, 12;
Need of Patience with President, 22 ff.;
Other Qualities, of President, in relation to, 20 ff.;
Relations, to Annual Budget, 25-26, to Faculty, 49 ff., of President, to, 10 ff.;
Rich Men as, 266 ff.;
Types of Boards, 189-90.
Tucker, of Dartmouth, Allusion to, 172.
Tullock, of Aberdeen, Allusion to, 290.
Tyler, Moses Coit, Allusion to, 165-6;
quoted, 42-43, 82-83.

Van Hise, quoted, 109-10.
Van Santvoord, C., quoted, 170-1.

Vassar, Matthew, Allusion to, 29;
"Valedictory" quoted, 275.
Virginia, University of, Allusion to, 327.

Walker, F. A., Allusion to, 32-33, 59, 131 ff., 292-3, 297-8.
Ward, Joseph, of Yankton, an Optimist, 148-9.
Warden, Title of, 6.
Warre, Edmund, Allusion to, 250-1.
Warren, of Oxford, Allusion to, 219.
Washington, George, Allusion to, 2, 112.
Wayland, Francis, Allusion to, 20, 31-32, 64, 212-3.
Wealth, and the President, 265 ff.
Webster, A. G., quoted, 313.
Wendell, Barrett, quoted, 318-9 note.
Western Reserve University, quotation from By-Laws of, 15 note.
Whewell, of Cambridge, Allusion to, 158-9;
Health of, 126-7.
White, A. D., Allusion to, 22;
quoted, 20, 44-45, 78-79, 86 ff., 238-9, 330 ff.
William and Mary College, 2.
Williams, Talcott, quoted, 101.
Willingness of President to be forgotten, 285.
Wilson, Woodrow, Address on Gilman's Retirement, 79-80;
Allusion to, 108 and note, 129, 157.
Wit and Humor, Sense of, in President, 242.
Witherspoon, Allusion to, 299-300.
Woods, D. W., Jr., quoted, 299-300.
Woolsey, T. D., Allusion to, 36-37, 48.
Writing and Speaking of President, 106 ff., 218 ff.

Yale University, 2;
Three Presidents of, 129 note.

LB
2341
.T52
cop. 6

THWING
The college president

1506538